

The Solicitors Journal.

LONDON, JANUARY 16, 1886.

CURRENT TOPICS.

IT IS EXPECTED that soon after Court of Appeal, No. 1, has disposed of the fourteen admiralty appeals which are in the list, appeals from the Chancery Division will be taken in that court until the return of the members of the common law bar from circuit.

WE MENTIONED some weeks ago that it was intended to institute an inquiry with regard to the chambers of the Queen's Bench Division similar to the recent investigation by the Chancery Chambers Committee. It is understood that the intention has been carried out, and that a committee on business in the common law chambers is now sitting.

WE ARE INFORMED that the long pending proceedings commenced by Messrs. MUNTON & MORRIS against the registrar of the Middlesex Registry, to test the legality of the fees charged on memorials, will be tried at the Clerkenwell County Court on Thursday next, the 21st inst., at ten o'clock, the judge having specially fixed that day and hour for the hearing.

MR. JUSTICE KAY has announced that four witness causes will be placed in his paper on Monday next, and Mr. Justice PEARSON has stated that he will commence hearing witness causes on the 25th inst. It would be convenient if the chancery judges would follow the practice adopted by Mr. Justice CHITTY of stating in the sittings paper the days on which this class of actions would be taken, so as to give sufficiently long and sufficiently public notice to solicitors.

SOME OF OUR READERS may possibly remember that about a quarter of a century ago an appointment was made to a mastership in lunacy which called forth so strong an expression of public opinion that the appointee forthwith resigned his position. Certain events led to an apprehension that the recent vacancy in the mastership might be filled with equally little regard to the delicate and responsible duties of the post, and it is therefore satisfactory to have to announce that an appointment has been made which appears to be unexceptionable. Mr. BULWER, Q.C., is well known as an able lawyer, experienced in affairs, and perfectly competent to fulfil the duties of his new office.

THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT HINT in Lord Justice BOWEN's article in the current number of the *Law Quarterly Review*, on which we comment elsewhere, that "the creation of a new judge will form a necessary part of any remedial scheme that can be devised" for dealing with the arrears in the Chancery Division, and that "some re-organization and some considerable fusion of the separate equity courts and chambers are needed if delays are to be avoided, expense saved, and arrears reduced into reasonable limits." There is reason to believe that a Bill is in course of being drafted to carry out changes of which the recent Rules of Court are only an instalment, and it seems probable that it may embrace proposals on the lines above indicated.

THE MEMORIAL to the Lord Chancellor, signed by eminent counsel

and City solicitors, calling attention to the unsatisfactory arrangements for the trial of City of London actions, has borne fruit in the adoption of the eminently reasonable course of a conference on the subject between the Lord Chief Justice and several leading City solicitors. The grievance is too serious to brook delay. Before the Order in Council of 1883, transferring the London Sittings to the Royal Courts, the Guildhall Sittings usually occupied six courts about six weeks in each year. But this time was seldom sufficient for the proper trial of all the cases in the list. Cases had frequently to be postponed, owing to lack of time to try them. The hope that the evils arising from this cause might be obviated was the main reason why many eminent City firms of solicitors signed a memorial to the Corporation, asking them to make the necessary request for the Order in Council, and why we, at the time, strongly urged the advisability of the removal. Another reason was the inconvenience occasioned by six courts sitting together at Guildhall, with the result that the same counsel and solicitors were often retained in cases in several courts at the same time. If, as we hoped might have been arranged, one court (not necessarily with the same judge) had sat throughout the legal year for the trial of London cases, both these grievances would have been removed, or, at all events, greatly mitigated. But what has been the course adopted? It is shewn in the recent memorial, which states that it has of late been the custom to devote about a week only, at the end of each sittings, to the disposal of these actions. The list for the Michaelmas Sittings consisted of seventy-two causes. Seven days were allotted for their trial, and about a dozen special and a few common jury cases only were disposed of. The result of the change in the place of trial is, therefore, actually to diminish the time allotted for the trial of London actions, while the inconvenience arising from the contemporaneous sitting of several courts for the same class of cases is continued unabated. We are aware of some of the difficulties which may have led to the present state of things, but they are capable of being surmounted, and it is earnestly to be hoped that the recent conference may result in some well-devised scheme for putting an end to the serious grievance which at present exists.

THE DECLARATION under the Lodgers' Goods Protection Act, 1871 (34 & 35 Vict. c. 79), need not state that no rent is due (if such be the case) to the superior landlord, nor that the declarant is a lodger. So it was laid down by the Court of Appeal in the recent case of *Ex parte Harris* (34 W. R. 132), but we think there is some reason to question the correctness of the decision. The 1st section of the Act enacts that "if any superior landlord shall levy a distress on any goods of any lodger for arrears of rent due to such superior landlord by his immediate tenant, such lodger may serve such superior landlord, or his bailiff, with a declaration in writing made by such lodger setting forth that such immediate tenant has no right of property or beneficial interest in the goods so distrained, and that such goods are the property or in the lawful possession of such lodger, and also setting forth whether any and what rent is due, and for what period, from such lodger to his immediate landlord," and by section 2, if any superior landlord or his bailiff, after having been served with the before-mentioned declaration, "shall levy a distress on the goods of the lodger, he shall be guilty of an illegal distress," and two justices of the peace have power to make an order for restoration of the goods. In *Ex parte Harris* a restoration order had been made, although the declarant did not state either that she was a lodger or that she owed no rent to her own landlord, and a divisional court refused to grant a rule for a *certiorari* to bring up and quash the order. The Court of Appeal has affirmed this decision. The first point is perfectly clear. The Act nowhere says that the fact of lodgership must be stated, therefore it would be going beyond

the requirements of the Act to require such a statement. On the second point, Lord Esher, M.R., said that the meaning of the words that the declaration is to set forth "whether any and what rent is due" is that the declaration must state what rent, if any, is due, but that if no rent at all is due, the declaration need not state that fact. "If," proceeded the learned judge, "the declaration does not state that any rent is due, it is the same as if it stated that no rent is due." This very liberal construction of the statute is the more remarkable because, from refusing a rule, the court does not appear to have thought the point arguable. Surely there is some ground for the contention that the words "whether any and what rent is due" mean "whether any rent is due or not, and if any rent be due, how much." There would be no hardship in such a construction of the statute.

FRESH QUESTIONS are continually arising with respect to the new Rules of Court. On the subject of orders for the payment of purchase-money into court, it is now recognized that, in order to save the expense of one order, a course is prescribed which may necessitate three orders, or, to speak more correctly, one direction and two orders. The so-called purchase order used to combine in itself all that was required; in future there is to be a direction signed by the chief clerk for payment of the purchase-money into court; then, on the application of the purchaser, an order to put a stop on the fund; then, on the application of the plaintiff, an order to invest the purchase-money. In short, three stamps and three sets of attendances instead of one. It is not yet settled in the chambers of all the chancery judges how this matter is to be dealt with, but Mr. Justice CHITTY has directed that, wherever the purchaser requires a stop on the fund, an order is to be drawn up; and there appears to be every probability that the old practice of drawing up purchase orders will be reverted to. Mr. Justice CHITTY has also directed that all orders made at his chambers, except procedure orders, shall be sent to the registrars to be drawn up as heretofore. The new rules, 74, 74a, of ord. 55, have already given rise to an important doubt. Hitherto it has been the practice to "enter"—that is, to copy on to the records of the court for preservation—all orders made at chambers which were brought in for that purpose. The two rules mentioned above, when read together, appear to shew unmistakably that orders drawn up by the chief clerks are not to be entered. How, then, are they to be recorded? and supposing the original signed by the chief clerk is lost or mislaid, how is a duplicate or office copy to be obtained? It is true that many of the orders which will be evidenced by a memorandum signed by a chief clerk, are of so ephemeral a nature that their primary object is attained within a few days, and they are never wanted again except for the purposes of taxation of costs; but there are many important orders made at chambers, particularly that large class of orders made in foreclosure actions, or under the Settled Land Acts, or under the Conveyancing Acts, relating to the title to land, which it is essential should be preserved by being entered. Possibly the other judges of the Chancery Division will see fit to give directions to the same purport as those given by Mr. Justice CHITTY. It is to be presumed that the Rules of December, 1885, are not intended to interfere with the Rules of the 11th of November, 1862, regulating the mode of proceeding under the Companies Act, 1862. These rules are still in force, not having been annulled by the R. S. C., 1883. One of these rules (rule 52) prescribes that all orders made in chambers—i.e., all orders made under these rules in chambers—shall be drawn up in chambers, unless specially directed to be drawn up by the registrar, and shall be entered in the same manner, and in the same office, as other orders made in chambers. It might be said that other orders made in chambers are not to be entered under the new rules, and, therefore, that orders made at chambers in the matter of the winding up of a company are not to be entered; but the rule must be supposed to speak of the practice existing at the time it was made, and, if this were not the case, it would not be very material, as, according to rule 57 of the same rules, a register is to be kept at chambers of all proceedings under the Act, and it would be a simple matter to place a copy of any order on that register. This direction to keep a register of proceedings in chambers refers to the Chancery Consolidated Orders, 35, rule 57, and the same rule

is reproduced in R. S. C., 1883, ord. 55, r. 73, with the material variation that for the word "register" is substituted the word "notes." There would not, therefore, in the case of orders made at chambers, other than orders made under the Winding-up Acts, be a register to refer to, but only notes. It is hardly needful to point out that a register would contain a verbally accurate copy of an order, while a note would not necessarily afford more than fragmentary and imperfect information.

MR. BRADLAUGH has taken the oath in the form and manner prescribed by the Parliamentary Oaths Act, 1866, as amended by the Promissory Oaths Act, 1868, and the Speaker, "after a full consideration of what ought to be his conduct," has declined to give effect to the suggestion that "Mr. BRADLAUGH should not be permitted to go through the form of taking the oath without an opportunity being afforded to the House of Commons of expressing its opinion upon the proceeding." It will be remembered that the late Speaker referred the question arising upon the Oaths Act to the decision of the House, which, after many intermediate inquiries and resolutions, ultimately declined to allow Mr. BRADLAUGH either to take the oath or to make an affirmation. At first sight there may seem to have been a discrepancy between the course adopted by the two Speakers, but, in reality, this is not the case. When first elected in 1880, Mr. BRADLAUGH claimed to affirm, not to take the oath, and the question which the late Speaker referred to the House was the very substantial one whether Mr. BRADLAUGH was, in the words of the 4th section of the Act of 1866, either "a person of the persuasion of the people called Quakers, or some other person for the time being by law permitted to make a solemn affirmation or declaration instead of an oath." This question the House practically relegated to the decision of a court of law, and the court (*Clarke v. Bradlaugh*, 29 W. R. 516, L. R. 7 Q. B. D. 38) decided it in the negative, although the House of Lords reversed this decision (31 W. R. 667, L. R. 8 App. Cas. 354), on the ground that the Crown alone could sue for the penalty under the Act of 1866. The question now arises whether a court of law can visit Mr. BRADLAUGH with any penalties for taking the oath. We do not see how it can. The two Acts which regulate the taking of the oath have been complied with in every detail of form, and, as might have been expected, they are absolutely silent as to any mode for examining a member on the *voir dire*, or for visiting him with penalties if he should turn out to have been an Atheist at the time of taking the oath. Nor are we aware of any precedent for any legal proceeding being taken against a person who has taken an oath, though not entitled to take it. There still remains the technical difficulty that an Atheist, though not one of the persons to whom the Parliamentary Oaths Act, as amended by the Promissory Oaths Act, applies, cannot be legally prevented from taking the oaths—a difficulty which Parliament may either solve by a measure on the lines of Lord REDSDALE's Bill, disqualifying an Atheist *eo nomine*, or by an Affirmation Bill, allowing all members to affirm.

THE MONUMENT to Mr. STREET in the Central Hall of the Royal Courts is fast approaching completion. It consists of a seated life-sized figure of the eminent architect, placed upon an oblong pedestal, the front and side panels of which are now being carved.

Lord Coleridge received on Wednesday afternoon, in his private room at the Royal Courts of Justice, several of the leading City of London solicitors, in order to confer with them about the trial of London actions, the mode of hearing which has of late been considered extremely unsatisfactory by the various parties engaged in them by reason of the short time allotted for their disposal, about a week at the end of each sitting being generally devoted to that purpose. His lordship was engaged for some time in conference with these gentlemen, Masters George Pollock and Erle being also present. The meeting was a strictly private one.

Mr. Baron Huddleston has been prevented by illness from going on the Oxford Circuit. Mr. Justice Wills takes the learned baron's place on circuit until he recovers.

THE LAW COURTS UNDER THE JUDICATURE ACTS.

LORD JUSTICE BOWEN contributes to the *Law Quarterly Review* for the present month a very interesting article on the above-mentioned subject. The general outcome of the article is, we think, to shew that, at the present time, it certainly cannot be said that the result of the sweeping changes of late years is quite such a success as the promoters of the recent legislation anticipated. One of the leading topics of the Lord Justice's article is a review of the various modes suggested of dealing with the formidable arrears existing in both divisions of the High Court and their prevention for the future. Lamentation over the existence of arrears was a constant feature of our legal experience before the Judicature Acts, and, if there was one object which the law reformers of that day proposed to themselves more confidently than another, it was the abolition of arrears; yet, nevertheless, we find that the accumulation of arrears under the new system is now as bad as, if not worse than, ever. We have often indicated a doubt whether one of the prevailing fallacies of law reform is not a tendency to believe too much in the virtue of re-arrangement of machinery. There are reasons, we think, for this tendency to be found in the history of our law. But we believe that the truth is, as we have before suggested, that arrears must, from time to time, exist, unless there is a positive surplus of judicial force available above average requirements, because legal business is not secreted by the social organism at a uniform rate. In order to keep the business at all times equally well in hand, we believe that it would be necessary to have so much judicial strength that there would at times be a certain waste of it. We doubt whether the nation would be prepared to pay for this surplus of judicial strength; and, besides, there is, no doubt, a feeling on the part both of the judges and the public that, if the number of the judges of the superior court were too largely increased, it would tend to diminish the *status* of the office.

The object of the learned Lord Justice's essay is not controversial; he does not propound any cut and dried scheme for dealing with the evils in question, but confines himself, for the most part, to indicating the points that are worthy of consideration. On one point he is very clear, and that is a point on which he is entitled to speak with authority—viz., that the desired economy of judicial time cannot be attained by throwing any of the functions now exercised by the divisional courts upon the Court of Appeal, because such a course would necessitate a corresponding increase in the number of the judges constituting that court. Various proposals have been made—e.g., that all applications for new trials and appeals from chambers should go direct to the Court of Appeal. It is argued by some that the Divisional Court is, under the existing system, an anomaly, and that, as in the Chancery Division the court of first instance is always a single judge, and the only appeal from such judge is to the Court of Appeal, so, in the Queen's Bench Division, the appeal should be always from the single judge to the Court of Appeal. This is, no doubt, a very taking argument at first sight, but we are disposed to think that there are certain countervailing matters which are worthy of consideration, though we are not at present prepared to say that they ought to preponderate. Not only would the Court of Appeal certainly have to be increased in number, as already pointed out; but there is another consideration—viz., that certainly a greater proportion of its business would be of a comparatively more trivial nature. This is not, in our opinion, conducive to the dignity and *prestige* of a court of appeal. Our idea of a court of appeal is that it is not intended merely as an engine for rapidly deciding cases between parties, but also for ascertaining the law. A court that should be constantly occupied with small motions by way of appeal from chambers, and the ordinary routine matters of common law work, is hardly, to our mind, performing the appropriate functions of the Court of Appeal as it was originally conceived. The Court of Appeal would, under such an arrangement, substantially be much in the same position as the old courts *in banc*, and what would really be effected, in substance, would be the abolition of the intermediate Court of Appeal between those courts and the House of Lords which formerly existed in the Exchequer Chamber. It may be that this is the direction which further progress must take, but we cannot help fearing that there

would be serious drawbacks to this scheme in its effect upon the *status* of the court. It does not always follow that that which is most symmetrical is most convenient or expedient. The argument for abolishing divisional courts because there are none in the Chancery Division is based upon a tacit assumption that the character of chancery work and common law work, and the exigencies of the business in the two divisions, are similar, which does not seem to us to be proved. At the conclusion of the Lord Justice's essay will be found some very weighty observations with regard to the importance of keeping up the *status* of a court of appeal and to certain features of the present system which involve a danger in this respect. We have not, however, space to refer to them at length.

It being therefore obvious from the observations of the learned Lord Justice that, unless the staff of the Court of Appeal is increased, no relief can be looked for in that direction, the only other possibility of dealing with the arrears on the common law side—which, it should be observed, are, for the most part, in the *Nisi Prius* lists—would, unless the number of judges were increased, be by diminishing the number of divisional courts, and so enabling more judges to sit at *Nisi Prius*. The Lord Justice indicates as a matter worthy of consideration the question whether the Crown paper and appeals from inferior courts could be taken by a single judge. So far as our experience goes we cannot think that such a course would be satisfactory with regard to a great deal of the business included in the Crown paper. So far as concerns Crown business properly so called, at any rate, we are of opinion that there is hardly any branch of the business of our courts that is of more importance to the community at large. Many of the cases, though they may not be of importance by reason of a large sum being at stake in the particular case, are of very great importance from the number of cases they govern all over the country, and rating cases not unfrequently involve very large sums and very important questions of principle. Appeals from magistrates are often of more importance to the community at large than many a heavy mercantile case, though it may involve a large stake to individuals.

One point upon which we are glad to see that the Lord Justice commits himself to a definite opinion is a matter which we have before urged—viz., the desirability of grouping the circuit business at certain centres—a course which, in his opinion, would be a benefit to the bar and a great economy of judicial time. A great part of the arrears in the Queen's Bench Division is caused by the frequent absence of so many judges on circuit; and we believe that, if an economy of judicial time could be effected in that respect, it would go far to prevent the mischiefs complained of in the present system. Any advantage gained with regard to the common law business by the Judicature Act has, we believe, been to a great extent counter-balanced by the increase of the number of assizes that has taken place.

We are glad to see the observations made by the Lord Justice on the cry for the economizing of judicial time by the abolition of the Long Vacation. He shews, in our opinion most convincingly, that there is no subject on which there is more illusion prevalent. Unless there were more judges, the abolition of the Long Vacation could make no difference, for each judge must have a vacation at some time, and probably as long a vacation as at present. If more courts sit in September, fewer must sit in May or February.

There is one topic to which the Lord Justice alludes which is, to our mind, of great importance. The subject is one that involves a very serious conflict of antagonistic principles to which we have before alluded. He points out very forcibly that the working of the Judicature Act, so far as the substitution of divisional courts for the old courts *in banc* is concerned, is unfavourable to the probability of the existence of special knowledge of a particular branch of law in the tribunal. The principle of specialism may, no doubt, be carried too far, and ought not to be allowed too entirely to predominate; but we cannot help feeling assured that in a tribunal of first instance, at any rate, the desirability of special familiarity with the particular business in hand is very great. Setting chancery lawyers to try murders and determine appeals from magistrates, and common lawyers to take chancery business in Long Vacation, is, in our opinion, on the whole a mistake.

Mr. Charles Russell, Q.C., M.P., who has been in the south of France recruiting his health, has returned to town quite recovered.

HOW SHOULD THE LAND LAWS BE REFORMED?

IV.

A PLEA FOR REGISTRATION OF ASSURANCES.

A LEARNED contributor has favoured us with the following statement of the reasons in favour of a register of assurances:—

The article under the above interrogatory in the last number of the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL may not inappropriately be followed by some further consideration of the subject of Land Registration.

The Land Transfer Act, 1875 (Lord Cairns' Act), like its predecessor, Lord Westbury's Act, is admitted to have proved a failure. The Select Committee on Land Titles and Transfer, in their report of June, 1879, speaking of the later Act, say: "The Act may be considered to have become, for all practical purposes, a dead letter." That committee considered the question, so often mooted, of making land transferable like stock, and say: "If, indeed, an Act of Parliament could be passed for England and Ireland either prohibiting the owner of property from tying it up or charging it, except in a particular manner, or giving the possessory proprietor the right of dealing with it as if it was his own; in other words, if the law either recognised nothing but estates in fee simple, or gave to the holder of land the same power of disposition which the holder of stock now enjoys, the registration of titles would be as easy as the title itself would be simple. But such changes would be so opposed to the general feeling of the country that, for the present at least, it would be idle to consider them seriously." And, further on, the committee say: "Upon the whole, therefore, the position of the question appears to your committee to be as follows:—On the one hand, they are informed, on the authority of Mr. Follett and Mr. Holt, that no system of registration of titles can be devised which will be voluntarily adopted; and, on the other hand, they are told by the Lord Chancellor—"Lord Cairns—"that he has not yet seen any way in which the registration of titles could be made compulsory."

This is nearly all that it seems necessary to say on the subject of registration of titles, but there will be occasion by-and-by again to refer to the report above mentioned.

It may not be out of place, however, to advert to something that occurs in the report of the Land Transfer Commission appointed in 1868, as it will be seen in the sequel how much the views expressed in that report as to the object of land registration differ from those taken by earlier commissions, to which reference will be presently made. The report says (paragraph 63): "We ask, What is the object of establishing a registry in England? Surely it is for the purpose of more easily and quickly transferring land. Ours is a commercial country, and we desire all property, even land, to pass readily from hand to hand. The thing wanted is not security of the landowners, for they are secure enough now; nor security of purchasers, for they are content with what they get in this respect; but ease of transfer."

Now, turning to the subject of registration of assurances, the Real Property Commissioners in their second report, and the Registration and Conveyancing Commissioners appointed in 1847, unanimously recommended the establishment of a general register of assurances. The former commissioners say, referring to the evils resulting from the existing state of the law, which a general register is adapted to remove, "The most important evil is the insecurity of title." They mention some of the various cases in which false titles are most easily made by suppression of documents. Of these cases it seems sufficient here to mention two—(1) suppression by a former absolute owner of a settlement by which his interest has been reduced to a tenancy for life; (2) suppression of a mortgage by a proprietor who has with-held or got back the deeds on some pretext from the mortgagee. The reported cases contain instances of both these classes. *Evans v. Bicknell* (6 Ves. 174), *Lloyd's Banking Co. v. Jones* (33 W. R. 781, L. R. 29 Ch. D. 221), may be mentioned as giving instances of the first class; and *Heath v. Creak* (23 W. R. 95, L. R. 10 Ch. 22), *Waldy v. Gray* (23 W. R. 676, L. R. 20 Eq. 238), *Northern Counties of England Fire Insurance Co. v. Whipp* (32 W. R. 626, L. R. 26 Ch. D. 482), *Manners v. Mew* (L. R. 29 Ch. D. 725), may be mentioned as giving instances of the second class. But it is not, of course, to be supposed that the only instances falling within these classes of cases are those found in reports of decisions, and whatever may be the number of frauds actually perpetrated, the care and vigilance necessary to prevent their perpetration have to be taken into account.

It may here be mentioned that the Real Property Commissioners, in noticing the existing local registers for Middlesex and Yorkshire, and that the local Registry Acts are imperfect, say:—"With all their disadvantages, however, these registers are generally considered to be, on the whole, productive of good, and no attempt has been made to abolish them."

The Registration and Conveyancing Commissioners take the same view as the Real Property Commissioners as to the mischiefs

arising from the possible suppression of deeds. They say, "As possession of the land is no proof either of the title thereto or of the extent of interest therein, so neither is the possession of the title deeds conclusive. The purchaser has to guard against the suppression of deeds, whether wilful or accidental; he has (among other things) to assure himself that the vendor in possession of the land and title deeds has concealed no settlement, and suppressed no will; that he has not charged the estate which he offers as unincumbered, and that no power has been executed to defeat or lessen his apparent interest. The fact that such suppressions are rare (if, indeed, it be a fact that they are rare) does not relieve him of the necessity of inquiry. What is possible to happen, it is strictly necessary to guard against."

Both sets of commissioners dwell also upon the advantage of a registry with reference to the difficulties attending covenants for the production of title deeds.

The Registration of Assurances Bill of 1853 was based on the report of the Registration and Conveyancing Commission, and Lord Cranworth, then Chancellor, said, on moving the second reading, "The object with which he submitted the present Bill to their lordships was to put an end, as far as practicable, and he believed it would almost completely put an end, to insecurity of title" (*Hans. Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, vol. 124, p. 930). His lordship then points out that what has to be ascertained for safety is a negative, as that there has been no settlement—no mortgage. He says (*ib.*, p. 934), speaking of the Middlesex and Yorkshire Registries, "The advantage was much prized, though the mode of operation was defective. Still, they had been felt to be an improvement." And Lord Overstone (no mean commercial authority), on the third reading of the Bill, expressed his cordial concurrence in the measure, and said: "He believed that it might be passed with most perfect safety to the landed proprietors, and the highest authorities of the law had pronounced it as the only true and solid foundation upon which they could hope to build up further improvements in the law of real property." He further said: "against the single authority of Lord St. Leonards they had the opinion of the most distinguished men in the country, and the highest legal authorities in the House" (*ib.*, vol. 126, p. 1230). This Bill passed the Lords, was read a second time in the Commons, and referred to a Select Committee. That committee had also two other Bills relating to transfer of land referred to them, and by their report, made late in the session, after noticing that the Registration of Assurances Bill contained within itself two distinct principles of registration—one contemplating the registration of all assurances in any manner relating to land, the other proposing that the legal title alone shall be entered on the registry—and that the two other Bills proceed on the latter principle, and mentioning that a scheme for the registration of "title" or "legal ownership" had been brought under their notice, recommended the House not to proceed with the Bill for the Registration of Assurances, and suggested the appointment of a commission for considering the subject of registration of title. Thus the Registration of Assurances Bill came to an end.

A commission was issued in the next year accordingly, which included the first Lord Westbury, then Sir Richard Bethell, and with regard to the registration of assurances it may not be out of place to quote the admission in their report, where they say, "That a register of assurances would give increased security of title we see no doubt. All those evils and objections which call for protection against the suppression of documentary evidence of title would, we think, be removed or remedied by a general register of deeds and other assurances relating to land." The commissioners, however, after weighing the objections to it, recommended registration of title, and their report was followed by Lord Westbury's Act of 1862, already noticed, and about which, or the Act of 1875, no more need here be said.

Returning now to the report of the Select Committee on Land Titles and Transfer above referred to, it will be seen that they come back to registration of assurances as the only practicable kind of land registration. The committee say, "That registration of titles is, in the abstract, to be preferred to registration of assurances may at once be conceded, for the former aims at presenting the intending purchaser or mortgagee with the net result of former dealings with the property, while the latter places the dealings themselves before him, and leaves him to investigate them for himself. . . . It must not be forgotten, however, that if every assurance relating to land were registered a basis would be laid which would make the registration of possessory titles a comparatively simple matter." They further say, "That a register giving in a succinct form a record of all dealings with land must afford some protection against fraud seems self-evident. . . . It is a noteworthy fact, too, that all the recent perpetrators of land frauds have selected for their operations counties and districts where no registry exists. To affirm that there are frauds—such as those carried on by fraudulent personation—which could not be prevented by registration, is only to say that there are certain forms of rascality in the world against which no amount of precaution can effectually guard." The committee then notice the doctrine of *Le Neve v. Le Neve*, and point out the necessity of every instrument taking effect according

to prior
the com
register
register
strict re
upon th
and see
posed t
registri
Probab
the first
then a
with th
recomm
commen
and We
with in
compr
Since
Act, 18
previou
Act con
Registr
notice,
away t
at leng
it prov
The
directi
experie
the Com
out, an
Englan

The
usually
observ
demise
the les
was he
Vaugh
covenan
that t
lessee
This w
quiet
ment o
parties
v. Dyer
310), a
which
the co
"prov
that t
renew
ducing
ment o
judge
renew
Boileau
determ
The re
the cov
the pr
and a
consid
other
entry.

The
versary
in Jun
elected
Mr.
the er
summer
these o
witness

to priority of registration in the absence of actual fraud. Later on, the committee say, "It is obvious that the labour of searching a land register will be diminished in proportion as the area covered by the register is reduced, and a strong argument in favour of local or district registries in England has been based upon this fact as well as upon the greater convenience, both for the purposes of registration and search, which such registries afford. Your committee are disposed to think that these arguments are well founded, and that local registries might be advantageously established in convenient centres. Probably the principal county court or probate registries might, in the first instance at least, be used for that purpose." The committee then refer to the advantage of registering at length as doing away with the necessity of covenants for production. Finally, besides recommending various alterations affecting conveyancing, they recommend the establishment in convenient local centres in England and Wales of district registries of assurances affecting land, provided with indexes not only referring to the persons but to the property comprised in the registered instrument.

Since the report last referred to was made, the Yorkshire Registries Act, 1884, has been passed (amended last session), by which the Acts previously in force in the three Ridings have been repealed. That Act contains provisions, apparently following in great measure the Registration of Assurances Bill of 1883, taking away the effect of notice, while providing for the case of actual fraud—also taking away the doctrine of tacking; it enables instruments to be enrolled at length or to be registered by memorial, and the rules made under it provide for a land index as well as an index of names.

The passing of this Act seems to be an important step in the right direction, and there seems no sufficient reason why, if after a short experience, it is found to work satisfactorily, the recommendation of the Committee on Land Titles and Transfer should not be carried out, and local registries of a like nature be established throughout England and Wales.

W.

RECENT DECISIONS.

COVENANT FOR QUIET ENJOYMENT.

(*Edge v. Boileau*, Q. B. D., 34 W. R. 108.)

The covenant for quiet enjoyment in leases, as is well known, is usually framed in the terms that the lessee "paying the rent and observing the covenants, shall peaceably and quietly enjoy the demised premises without any interruption or disturbance from or by the lessor or any other person claiming by, from, or under him." It was held more than 200 years ago, in *Hays v. Bickerstaff* (2 Mod. 34, Vaugh. 118), that the words, "paying the rent and performing the covenants," constitute not a condition, but a covenant; in other words, that the covenant for quiet enjoyment is not conditional upon the lessee paying the rent and performing the covenants of the lease. This was a strong but correct ruling, for otherwise the covenant for quiet enjoyment might be defeated by the delay of one day in payment of rent, which could never have been the intention of the parties. The decision in *Hays v. Bickerstaff* was followed in *Dawson v. Dyer* (5 B. & Ad. 584). But in *Finch v. Underwood* (L. R. 2 Ch. D. 310), and afterwards in *Bastin v. Bidwell* (L. R. 18 Ch. D. 238), in which all the decisions bearing on the point are collected by Kay, J., the court gave a strict construction to a covenant for renewal, "provided the covenants in the lease have been performed," and held that the slightest breach of these covenants disentitled the lessee to a renewal. This being so, there seemed to be some prospect of inducing the court to overrule *Hays v. Bickerstaff*, and from the judgment of Kay, J., in *Bastin v. Bidwell*, it seems that that learned judge would have made no distinction between the covenant for renewal and the covenant for quiet enjoyment. But in *Edge v. Boileau* the court, without going very fully into the point, has again determined that the covenant for quiet enjoyment is not conditional. The real object of the insertion of the words above referred to in the covenant is to except the case of re-entry by the landlord under the proviso for re-entry (see *Dawson v. Dyer*, 5 B. & Ad., at p. 588), and as the words are somewhat misleading, it may be matter for consideration whether it would not be better to substitute for them other words directly referring to the exercise of the power of re-entry.

The Lord Chancellor has consented to preside at the fifty-fourth anniversary festival of the United Law Clerks' Society, which will take place in June next. Mr. Henry Hall, of the Treasury, Whitehall, has been elected chairman of the society for the ensuing year.

Mr. Justice Pearson announced, on Monday, that he intends, during the ensuing fortnight, to proceed with the hearing of adjourned summonses and further considerations, provided that there is enough of these classes of business to occupy the court during that time. The trial of witness actions will be commenced on Monday, the 25th inst.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE NEW RULES OF COURT.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Signs of carelessness in drafting the new Rules of Court, which came into operation on the 1st of January, and of haste in preparing them for publication, are unfortunately only too apparent; so palpable, indeed, that in some instances they would be amusing, were it not for the serious consequences to litigants which such haste and carelessness must inevitably entail.

Words are now interpolated in ord. 55, r. 2, sub-section (6), which obviously require to be preceded by a conjunction, the omission whereof occasions difficulty of construction which can only be set at rest at the suitor's expense. Still more doubtful is the interpretation to be placed upon the new rule 15a. of order 58, which seemingly provides that the time for appealing against an order made on further consideration shall be the same as the time for appealing against the order on further consideration! The form printed as Form 2, Appendix K., No. 16, is, in reality, framed in substitution of Form No. 16 in Appendix L. But this is not all. The note which heads the new rules is calculated to mislead. Without counting the bulky Funds Rules and Orders as to Fees, we have, since October, 1883, been favoured with three sets of new rules, two of which, issued in February and October, 1884, respectively, dealt with the fees of examiners, a scale of which was prescribed by the Rule Committee of Judges on the 4th of February, 1884. No reference being made to these in the headnote to the latest instalment, many may be induced to turn to the Rules of 1883, when they will be at pains to discern the connection between the last rule (38) of order 37 and the new rule (51) of that order. As, however, this new rule amends the scale of examiners' fees, they will eventually perceive that it is intended to follow rule 50 of February, 1884, but the discovery will hardly compensate them for time wasted through the draftsman's negligence.

G. E. LYON.

Temple, Jan. 12.

* [Query.—Is not this doubt removed by the omission of the comma after the word "cause" in the new rule?—ED. S. J.]

CASES OF THE WEEK.

COURT OF APPEAL.

REG. v. RUDGE AND OTHERS—C. A. No. 1, 13th January.

PRACTICE—COURT OF APPEAL—CHANGE OF PLACE OF TRIAL IN CRIMINAL MATTER—JURISDICTION TO HEAR APPEAL—JUDICATURE ACT, 1873 (36 & 37 VICT. c. 66), s. 47; PALMER'S ACT (19 & 20 VICT. c. 16), s. 3.

In this case the question was raised as to the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal to hear an appeal from an order of the Queen's Bench Division refusing to change the place of trial of the prisoners. The prisoners were committed for trial on a charge of murder at the Carlisle Assizes, and the Queen's Bench Division refused to grant a *certiorari*, under section 3 of Palmer's Act, for the purpose of the prisoners being tried at the Central Criminal Court. A motion was thereupon made to the Court of Appeal to grant a *certiorari*. The following cases were cited:—*Reg. v. Weil* (31 W. R. 60, L. R. 9 Q. B. D. 701), *Reg. v. Steel* (25 W. R. 34, L. R. 2 Q. B. D. 37), *Reg. v. Foote* (31 W. R. 490, L. R. 10 Q. B. D. 378), *Reg. v. Pemberton* (28 W. R. 362, L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 95). The court (Lord Esher, M.R., Cotton and Bowen, L.JJ.) held that the Court of Appeal had no power to entertain the appeal, section 47 of the Judicature Act, 1873, providing that "no appeal shall lie from any judgment of the High Court of Justice in any criminal cause or matter, save for some error of law apparent upon the record." The Court of Appeal now stood in the place of the old Exchequer Chamber, which had no jurisdiction to hear appeals in criminal matters, except for error on the record. This application to remove the trial of the prisoners from the jurisdiction of the tribunal that would in the ordinary course try them was an application to regulate the trial of the prisoners, and so was an application in the criminal cause or matter; and the decision of the Divisional Court refusing the *certiorari* was a "judgment" within the meaning of section 47 of the Judicature Act, 1873. No appeal, therefore, lay. If authority were needed, *Reg. v. Steel* and *Reg. v. Foote* were decisions in point.—COUNSEL, C. Cavanagh. SOLICITOR, E. H. Biggin, for T. Johnson, Carlisle.

LONDON AND BLACKWALL RAILWAY CO. v. CROSS—C. A. No. 2, 12th January.

ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS—UNAUTHORISED USE OF NAME OF THIRD PARTY—INJUNCTION—LANDS CLAUSES CONSOLIDATION ACT, 1845, s. 68.

The question in this case was whether a person who had commenced arbitration proceedings under section 68 of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, for the purpose of ascertaining the value of property

compulsorily taken by a railway company, and in so doing had made use of the name of a third party without authority, could be restrained, at the instance of the railway company, from so doing. The Poplar and Greenwich Ferry Co. was incorporated by an Act, 52 Geo. 3, c. 148, for the purpose of establishing a ferry across the River Thames between Greenwich and the Isle of Dogs, and the company was thereby authorized to charge certain tolls for animals, carriages, and goods using the ferry. By another Act, 54 Geo. 3, c. 171, the ferry company was authorized to charge a toll of one penny for every person using the ferry. In 1868 the company demised the tolls of one penny and some of the rights given by the first Act for a term of forty-eight years from Christmas, 1866, and the lease authorized the lessees and their assigns to use the name of the company for the purpose of enforcing payment of the demised tolls. The benefit of this lease was afterwards assigned to the defendant Cross. By an Act passed in 1873 the London and Blackwall Railway Co. were authorized to run steam vessels for conveying passengers between their railway and Greenwich. This Act provided that the ferry company should be entitled to compensation from the railway company for any loss, damage, or injury which might be occasioned to them by reason of the exercise of the powers of the Act in respect of their ferry rights and the right to take the penny toll, and that the compensation should, in case of dispute, be settled in the manner provided by the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, for the settlement of disputed cases of compensation. In November, 1883, Cross served on the railway company a notice that the ferry company and Cross, as owners and lessee of the tolls, had suffered loss, damage, and injury by the exercise of the powers of the railway company, and that "we do respectively give you notice that the amount of our claim in respect of such loss, damage, and injury is the sum of £50,000, and that, unless you come to an agreement with us to pay us such amount, we desire to have the amount of compensation payable to us under the Act of 1873 settled by arbitration in manner prescribed by the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845." The notice purported to be given by Cross as attorney for the ferry company and in his own right. The ferry company considered themselves unable to give any further authority for the use of their name than that which was contained in the lease of 1868. The compensation proceedings were pending before an arbitrator, and the railway company brought this action to restrain Cross from proceeding with the arbitration, and they moved before Chitty, J., to restrain Cross from using the name of the ferry company in those proceedings. Chitty, J., was of opinion that no authority had been conferred upon Cross to use the name of the ferry company in the notice which he had served, and that as the court would have had jurisdiction to restrain the use of the ferry company's name without their authority in an action, it had equally power to restrain such unauthorized use in proceedings before an arbitrator. His lordship was also of opinion that the case was not within the decision of the Court of Appeal in *The North London Railway Co. v. The Great Northern Railway Co.* (L. R. 11 Q. B. D. 30), that the court had no jurisdiction to grant an injunction to restrain a party from proceeding with an arbitration in a matter beyond the agreement to refer, although the proceedings might be futile and vexatious. The Court of Appeal (LINDLEY, FRY, and LOPES, L.JJ.) reversed the decision. LINDLEY, L.J., said that the objections taken to the notice were, no doubt, formidable. It was said (1) that Cross had no right, in point of law, to use the name of the ferry company, and (2) that, if he had, the notice was bad in form, because he had lumped the amount for compensation without distinguishing what was due to the reversioner from what was due to the lessee; and it was said that, under no circumstances, could Cross obtain compensation under section 6 of the Act of 1873. The question was how the questions thus raised were to be determined, and when. Prior to 1851 there was some ground for contending that, when a person made an unfounded claim under the Lands Clauses Act, his right to bring that claim could be tried upon motion, and his proceeding might be stayed by injunction; and, on more than one occasion, Lord Cottenham had granted injunctions to restrain proceedings upon such unfounded claims. That practice was subsequently discussed and considered by Lord Truro, and, ever since 1851, it had been accepted as a principle that the proper way of trying the right to claim compensation under the Lands Clauses Act was not upon motion, but by action. Leaving out of consideration, for the present, the question whether Cross was, in fact, acting as attorney for the company, and taking the case of a person having no right whatever to receive compensation, but still proceeding, under the Lands Clauses Act, to claim it, it was well settled now that, in such a case, it was not right for the court to determine the question of title at that stage of the proceedings, and that the proper course was to leave the claimant to bring his action on the award, when, if he had no title, he would obtain nothing and must pay the costs of the action. At the same time, he was not aware of any method by which the company could succeed in recovering from him the costs of the arbitration, which, as prudent persons, they would obviously attend. And, notwithstanding the enlarged power of granting injunctions conferred upon the court by the Judicature Act, 1873, s. 25, the Court of Appeal had decided, in *The North London Railway Co. v. The Great Northern Railway Co.*, that the practice, as settled by Lord Truro, had not been altered, and that, if there was no jurisdiction, before the Judicature Act, to restrain a person from proceeding, under the Lands Clauses Act, to claim compensation on the ground that he was not entitled, there was none since. That was the true ground of the decision, which must not, however, be extended; and he did not say that in no case would it be right to restrain proceedings before an arbitrator. But it did go so far as this—that, under the Lands Clauses Act, the proper method of trying the question was in an action on the award, and not at any earlier stage. Assuming that Cross was using the name of the ferry company without any authority so to do, he did it at his own risk, and

must fail when he brought an action on the award to enforce it, and would have to pay the costs of that action. The company might fail in getting the costs of the arbitration, but they would not be any worse off than they would be in any other case of an unfounded claim for compensation under the Lands Clauses Act. Upon the balance of convenience and inconvenience in a proceeding under the Lands Clauses Act, it would be more inconvenient to entertain the question of authority at this stage. The principle upon which Chitty, J., had rested his judgment was that Cross was proceeding without authority, and that the court had jurisdiction to restrain him from using the name of his alleged principals, just as, if an action was brought without authority, it could be restrained by injunction. But that seemed to proceed on the principle that the court would restrain an abuse of its own process, and did not apply to a case like the present. FRY, L.J., was of the same opinion. He did not proceed on the assumption that the railway company were wrong in saying that Cross had no authority to use the name of the ferry company. Assuming that there was a false assumption of authority by Cross, it followed that his notice in the name of his alleged principals was a nullity, and any award made in pursuance of it would be a nullity also, and any action to enforce the award by the ferry company, or by Cross in the name of the company, must fail, and would be dismissed, with costs. The right time to determine the question whether the award could be enforced was when that action on the award came to be tried. This was not the case of a false assumption of authority in a proceeding in the court itself. There the court would undoubtedly have jurisdiction to prevent the abuse of its process and to keep its records true. But there was no general jurisdiction to restrain by injunction a false assumption of authority, so to speak, *in pais*. He was clearly of opinion that, in assuming that Cross was wrong in his allegation that he was acting as attorney for the company, this was not the time at which the court ought to interfere to restrain him from proceeding before the arbitrator. LOPES, L.J., concurred.—COUNSEL, Pollard; Romer, Q.C., and Nasmyth. SOLICITORS, Catarns, Jehu, & Hughes; Hollingsworth, Tyerman, & Andrews.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

Re G. A. BRIGHT-SMITH, Deceased—Chitty, J., 11th January.

WILL—MISDESCRIPTION—FREEHOLD INCLUDING COPYHOLD—FALSA DEMONSTRATIO.

In this case the testator, after devising a freehold house, devised "all my freehold farm situate at Edgware, and now in the occupation of J. B.," to trustees upon trusts in favour of his children generally. It appeared that the farm, which was the only real estate of the testator situate at Edgware, consisted of seventy-six acres, of which two-thirds only were freehold and the remainder copyhold, and that parts of the copyhold and freehold were undistinguishable. The will contained no residuary devise. It was submitted on behalf of the customary heir, the testator's eldest son, that the technical word "freehold" was used as a leading word, and must be strictly interpreted as comprising such parts only of the farm as were of that tenure, and *Hall v. Fisher* (1 Coll. 47), *Stone v. Greening* (13 Sim. 390), and *Leach v. Jay* (25 W. R. 574, L. R. 6 Ch. D. 496) were relied on. CHITTY, J., said that *Hall v. Fisher* was distinguishable from the case before the court, on the ground that there were technical limitations which fitted on to the technical word of gift, and also no residuary devise. *Stone v. Greening* was a decision on a case heard as a short cause. Both cases were decided when technical terms referring to real property were more strictly construed than when the case was a question involving personal property. Moreover, neither of those cases seemed to have received the assent of Lord Selborne in *Hardwick v. Hardwick* (21 W. R. 719, L. R. 16 Eq. 168). In that case Lord Selborne laid down principles regulating the construction to be put upon questions like that before the court, and he (Chitty, J.) thought that to follow a case which laid down principles was preferable to comparing one will with another. Lord Selborne had said in *Hardwick v. Hardwick* that if all the terms of description fitted some particular property, such terms could not be enlarged by extrinsic evidence so as to exclude anything which any part of those terms did not accurately fit; but, on the other hand, that, if the descriptive words, when examined, did not fit with accuracy, and required some modification for the sake of construing them sensibly, then the whole thing must be looked at fairly in order to see what were the leading words of description, and for that purpose evidence of extrinsic facts might be regarded. He was of opinion that the case fell within the latter portion of the rule. The principal and leading term in the devise was the word "farm" and not the word "freehold," and it was not the testator's intention when using that word to constitute a distinction and raise a contest amongst his children. The testator had used a misdescription which fell within the maxim, *Falsa demonstratio non nocet*. The copyhold portions of the farm were therefore comprised in the devise, notwithstanding the presence of the word "freehold."—COUNSEL, Macnaghten, Q.C., and Trevor White; Romer, Q.C., and Hull; T. C. Wright. SOLICITORS, Chester, Mayhew, Broome, & Griffiths; Pemberton & Garth; H. Stanley Smith.

Re SHEARMAN, Deceased, HARTMANN v. SHEARMAN—Chitty, J., 13th January.

PRACTICE—ADMINISTRATION SUMMONS—DEBTOR AND CREDITOR—STATUTE OF FRAUDS RAISED WITHOUT NOTICE.

This was an action for the administration of the estate of a deceased testator, commenced by summons in chambers, by a person claiming to be a creditor. The summons was adjourned into court, and the defendant,

the executrix of the will, raised at the hearing the defence that the claim was bad under the Statute of Frauds. The plaintiff objected that he had had no notice of the defendant's intention to raise any question under the statute. CHITTY, J., said that the principle he always acted on was that, where there were no pleadings, the party who desired to raise any question under the Statute of Frauds must give fair notice of his intention, either by letter or by affidavit. He acted upon that principle, not because a defence by the statute was shabby or frequently a sham defence—statements which were neither correct nor argumentative—but what was more to the point, because the person setting up the claim might be found to have a good and sufficient answer to the statute, and, that being so, it was only just and right that he should have notice of reliance on the statute. The plaintiff not pressing the objection he had raised, the summons was heard, and ultimately dismissed with costs. COUNSEL, *Ince, Q.C.; Chadwyck Healy; Romer, Q.C., and C. H. Turner.* SOLICITORS, *H. Savidge; J. G. Shearman.*

Re JORDAN, KINO v. PICKARD—Pearson, J., 12th January.

MARRIED WOMAN—LIFE ESTATE FOR SEPARATE USE WITH RESTRAINT ON ANTICIPATION—FORFEITURE CLAUSE—REMOVAL OF RESTRAINT BY COURT—CONVEYANCING ACT, 1881, s. 39.

This was an application by a married woman, under section 39 of the Conveyancing Act, 1881, that, notwithstanding a restraint on anticipation, she might be at liberty to bind her life interest under a will for the purpose of raising a loan. Under the will of her father, the applicant was entitled for her life for her separate use to the income of a one-thirteenth share of a moiety of his residuary estate, the capital being given after her death to her children. She and the other daughters of the testator were restrained from anticipating their life interests under the will. The will also provided that the income to which any person or persons whomsoever should or might become entitled for life, or for a less interest, under the will, should not, nor should any part thereof, be aliened or alienable, assigned or assignable, for the life of such respective tenants for life, or for any shorter or less period or interest, by act or default of theirs, or bankruptcy, or other act or operation of law. And that in case any such person or persons should charge, alien, or assign his interest, or any part thereof, either wholly or partially, or should become bankrupt, or should do or suffer any act, deed, or thing whereby such interest, or any part thereof, should become aliened or alienable, assigned or assignable, unto, or vested in, or charged in favour of any other person or persons, then, and in every such case, the life or other interest of every such person should be forfeited, and should cease and determine, and there was a gift over of the life or other interest in the event of a forfeiture. In support of the application, it was urged that the forfeiture clause did not apply to an interest which in its nature and by its creation was inalienable. PEARSON, J., thought that, if he acceded to the application, there would be so much risk of incurring a forfeiture of the life interest, that he ought not to grant the application. It could not be for the benefit of the applicant to place her in so much peril. If a forfeiture was once incurred, an appeal would be of no use. It would be better to leave the applicant to go to the Court of Appeal if she wished to do so. The power given to the court by section 39 ought not to be used indiscriminately. His lordship ordered the costs of the application to be paid out of the applicant's income.

After the order as to costs had been made, it was suggested to the court that it might have the effect of causing a forfeiture of the married woman's life interest by reason of the forfeiture clause. PEARSON, J., thought that there was some ground for the suggestion, and he accordingly altered the order, and simply directed that the applicant should pay the costs of the other parties, giving them liberty to apply in case the costs should not be paid. In that event, he said he would run the risk of causing a forfeiture of the life interest, for he thought that the other parties ought not to be left to pay their own costs. His lordship added that it was a serious question whether, notwithstanding the alteration in the law made by the Married Women's Property Act, there were not some cases in which a married woman ought not to be allowed to sue without a next friend. It was impossible to put a man and a woman in exactly the same position.—COUNSEL, *Cookson, Q.C., and W. Fooks; Sefton Strickland.* SOLICITORS, *Mear & Fowler; Roy & Cartwright.*

CASES AFFECTING SOLICITORS.

GIBBS v. TREDWELL, Re ARMSTRONG—C. A. No. 1, 11th January.

SOLICITOR—ORDER ON A SOLICITOR PERSONALLY TO PAY COSTS.

This was an application for an order that Mr. E. M. Armstrong, a solicitor, should pay Messrs. Dod & Longstaffe, solicitors, certain costs. Gibbs brought an action against Tredwell, and Tredwell paid into court under an order £108. In September, 1881, it was arranged that the action should be compromised, Gibbs to take £54 in satisfaction of his claim and costs, and Tredwell to take the remaining £54 out of court. Messrs. Dod & Longstaffe, who were Gibbs' solicitors, did not know of the compromise. Gibbs asked Armstrong to carry it out, and thereupon, on the 21st of September, 1881, an order was obtained on behalf of Gibbs, with the consent of Dod & Longstaffe, that, "on payment to Messrs. Dod & Longstaffe of their costs, to be taxed, Mr. E. M. Armstrong be appointed solicitor for the plaintiff in this action in the place of Messrs. Dod & Longstaffe." On the 22nd of September Armstrong obtained an order staying the action, and for payment out of court of £54 to him and the other £54 to Tredwell's solicitors, and on the

27th of September this sum was paid out to Armstrong. In an affidavit made by Armstrong it was stated that his costs in the matter had not been paid; that he had handed over the £54 to Gibbs, for which he produced a stamped receipt; and that, before he did so, Gibbs stated to him that he had seen Dod & Longstaffe on the 26th, and they had consented to take £16 for their costs, which he had paid them, and for which he produced their bill of costs receipted by them. Gibbs, however, made an affidavit contradicting these statements in Armstrong's affidavit. Dod & Longstaffe did not know that the £108 had been taken out of court until May, 1885, and their costs had, in fact, never been paid. They thereupon applied by summons for an order that Armstrong should pay their costs, as he had acted as Gibbs' solicitor and obtained the order for payment of the money out, and had the money paid out without first fulfilling the condition imposed by the order of the 21st of September—namely, seeing that Dod & Longstaffe were paid their costs. Day, J., made the order, but the Divisional Court reversed his decision, holding that the order of the 21st of September did not direct Armstrong personally to see the costs paid. Messrs. Dod & Longstaffe appealed. The court allowed the appeal. Lord Esher, M.R., said that Armstrong was liable under the ordinary jurisdiction of the court over its officers, it being the duty of the court to see that solicitors behaved honourably to their clients and to each other. In the present case if the action had gone on and the plaintiff had been successful, Dod & Longstaffe would have had a lien on the sum in court for their costs. But Gibbs, the plaintiff, settled the action without their knowledge, and if they had known of the settlement they would have had a lien on the sum of £54 for their costs. Dod & Longstaffe quite properly consented to the order changing solicitors upon being paid their costs. Now Armstrong knew of the settlement of the action, and he knew that he ought not to take the money out of court unless Dod & Longstaffe were either paid their costs *aliunde*, or unless a sufficient sum to pay them was left in court. Without, however, ascertaining from them whether they had been paid, or without making any inquiry, Armstrong the very next day, on the 22nd of September, obtained an order to take the £54 out of court. That order was the beginning of the wrong, and Dod & Longstaffe were thereby deprived of the security for their costs. That conduct on his part was most reckless, and was in disregard of Dod & Longstaffe's interest, and so the court would order him now to pay those costs personally. COTTON and BOWEN, L.JJ., concurred.—COUNSEL, *Finlay, Q.C., and Sills; Winch.* SOLICITORS, *Dod & Longstaffe; Churehley.*

BATTEN v. THE WEDGWOOD COAL AND IRON CO.—Pearson, J., 13th January.

SOLICITOR—NEGLIGENCE—LIABILITY—PROPERTY SOLD UNDER ORDER OF COURT—OMISSION OF SOLICITOR TO PROCURE INVESTMENT OF PURCHASE-MONEY—CHANCERY FUNDS RULES, 1874, r. 37.

A question was raised in this case as to the liability of a solicitor to make good the loss of interest occasioned by his omission to procure the investment of the purchase-money of property sold under the order of the court in an action. The action was brought on behalf of debenture-holders to realize their security. A receiver was appointed, and an order was made for the sale of the company's property comprised in the debenture-holders' trust deed. The plaintiff had the conduct of the sale. A sale having been effected for £1,600, an order was, on the 22nd of December, 1883, made that the purchaser should pay his purchase-money into court on or before the 19th of January, 1884, and that, at the request of the defendants, the money should be invested in Consols. The money was paid into court by the purchaser on the 21st of January, 1884, but the plaintiff's solicitor omitted to obtain any request from the defendants for the investment, and it was not invested. On the 25th of November, 1884, the action was heard on further consideration, and directions were then given for the application of the £1,600, which was the only fund realized by the action. The fund was greatly insufficient, and the result was that the receiver was, after the payment of some costs, entitled to the remainder of the fund. The carriage of the order was given to him, and he, having then discovered that the investment had not been made, procured the investment of the fund. He took out a summons, asking for a declaration that the plaintiff's solicitor was liable to pay the loss of interest which had accrued by his neglect to bespeak the investment. On behalf of the solicitor it was contended that he was responsible only to his own client, the plaintiff, and that, as no loss had been sustained by her, he was not liable at all. Rule 37 of the Chancery Funds Rules of 1874 (which were in force when the order of the 22nd of December, 1883, was made) provided that, "when an order directs the investment of money into court, the Chancery Paymaster may defer giving effect to such direction until a request in writing to give effect thereto has been left at the Chancery Pay Office, but it shall be the duty of the solicitor for the person having the carriage of such order or certificate to leave it and such request at the Chancery Pay Office without unnecessary delay." PEARSON, J., held that the solicitor was liable. He said that there was no imputation on him for what had happened beyond this, that, after the order for payment into court had been obtained, he or his clerk forgot to leave the order with the paymaster with a request for investment. His lordship did not agree with the contention that the solicitor was liable only to his own client. The conduct of the sale rested with him only because he was the solicitor for the plaintiff. As solicitor for the plaintiff he was discharging the duty which devolved on him. No other solicitor would have been entitled to charge for what he was doing. He was acting as an officer of the court, and in that character was liable to the court for the due discharge of his duty. Until corrected by a higher tribunal his lordship should hold that the court had jurisdiction to make a solicitor liable for not discharging his duty under such circumstances. His lordship held

that the solicitor was liable for the loss of interest which had resulted from the investment not having been made, but, as Consols had fallen in price between the time when it ought to have been made and the 25th of November, 1884, the amount thus gained must go in reduction of his liability. The money ought to have been invested within a week after it was paid into court, and the solicitor must pay interest on the money at three per cent. from the 28th of January to the 25th of November, 1884, less the amount gained by the fall in Consols.—COUNSEL, *Cookson, Q.C.*, and *E. Ford*; *Cassens-Hardy, Q.C.*, and *Heath*. SOLICITORS, *C. Harcourt*; *J. Vernon Muirgrave*.

WOOLLEY v. COLMAN—Pearson, J., 11th January.

COSTS—TAXATION—DEFENDANT IN TWO CAPACITIES—APPEARANCE BY TWO DIFFERENT SOLICITORS.

The question in this case was whether a person who was defendant to the action in two distinct capacities, and who had appeared by two different solicitors in those capacities respectively, could be allowed as against the plaintiff to carry in two separate bills of costs for taxation. The action was brought by a third mortgagee for the redemption of the mortgages prior to his own. H., one of the defendants, was the assignee by way of mortgage of the second mortgage, and he was also the trustee in the liquidation of the first mortgages. On the 17th of May, 1882, he applied for and obtained an order that, so far as he was sued as the trustee in the liquidation, he should be at liberty to be represented by S., a solicitor, a different person from the solicitor by whom he was represented in his character of assignee of the second mortgage. And it was ordered that the costs of the application should be costs in the action. After the making of this order, H., in the character of trustee in the liquidation, appeared by S. on various occasions when he also appeared in his other character by his other solicitor. On the 12th of February, 1885, on the plaintiff's application, an order was made dismissing the action, and foreclosing the plaintiff in respect of his claim as third mortgagee. And it was ordered that the plaintiff should pay to the defendants (including H.) their taxed costs of the action. Under this order H. carried in for taxation a bill of costs of the solicitor who had represented him in his character of assignee of the second mortgage, and he also claimed to carry in for taxation another bill of costs of the solicitor who had represented him in his character of trustee. The taxing master held that H. could have only one set of costs, and refused to tax the second bill. H. moved for a direction to the taxing master to tax the second bill. *PEARSON, J.*, refused the application. He said that, but for the order of May, 1882, it was plain that H. would have been entitled to one set of costs only, including all costs properly incurred by him in both capacities—that is, his costs as a defendant who represented two distinct interests. He thought that his two interests were or might be conflicting, and, therefore, he applied for and obtained the order of May, 1882. That order gave him no other right than this—that, in all matters relating to his interest as trustee, he might be represented by S. It said nothing about costs, except that it gave him the costs of his application for the order as costs of the action. There was no direction that he should have two sets of costs, and the question was whether, as against the plaintiff, he was entitled to carry in two bills of costs for taxation. The question need only be stated to put H. out of court. The order of May, 1882, was obtained only in his own interest; it was of no benefit to anyone else. It would be contrary to the whole practice of the court, and would be most vexatious, if a defendant who filled different characters could be represented by different solicitors, and be allowed different sets of costs for the different solicitors.—COUNSEL, *Cassens-Hardy, Q.C.*, and *E. Ford*; *Cookson, Q.C.*, and *Tanner*. SOLICITORS, *J. W. Sykes*; *H. W. Chatterton*.

READING ASSIZES.

(Before WILLS, J.)

Jan. 11, 12.—*Harris v. Brisco and another*.

The claim in this case was for damages for maintenance. *Underhill, Q.C.*, and *Harry Nash*, were counsel for the plaintiff, and *Jelf, Q.C.*, for the defendants.

The plaintiff alleged that in January, 1884, an action was commenced against him by one William Nailer in the Chancery Division, claiming to have a deed under which he had become the owner of Nailer's interest in a farm at Bucklebury set aside on the ground of fraud; that while this action was pending the defendants maintained it by paying a solicitor to conduct it on behalf of Nailer, and paying the costs of the witnesses and otherwise. This action was tried before Mr. Justice Kay, and dismissed with costs. Mr. Harris was compelled to pay his solicitor £113 for the costs of defending it, as Nailer was quite impecunious; and this amount and £5, his own expenses beyond, he sought to recover in this action as damages for the defendants' maintenance. That the defendant Brisco, having no interest in it, had taken the action in the Chancery Division and made it his own was not denied, but it was said that in all he did Mr. Brisco was acting from motives of pure charity, and because he honestly believed that Nailer was oppressed and unable to obtain his rights. The evidence was almost confined to the testimony of the parties. It appeared that although the plaintiff and the defendant Brisco lived not far from each other at Reading, and the plaintiff had long resided and was respectably known in that town, where he had formerly carried on business, Brisco had made no inquiries as to his respectability, but had acted upon the representations of Nailer, who at the time he knew was not a reputable character. The defendant Parker seemed to have acted as Brisco's agent in the matter.

Jelf argued that it must be shewn that the defendants acted maliciously, and he contended that the facts were not sufficient to prove that they acted otherwise than honestly upon information which they obtained, and that there was no ground for imputing motives other than charity for what was done. The learned counsel also cited authorities upon the law of maintenance.

WILLS, J., in giving judgment, said the action was seldom resorted to, but he thought there was good reason for such an action. His lordship decided the case upon the authority of *Bradlaugh v. Newdegate* (37 W. R. 792), but at the same time stated his own view of the law of maintenance. *Prima facie*, if a stranger embarked in litigation not his own, that was unlawful, and required explanation. It was essential in order to justify interference that the person interfering should have some interest in the subject-matter of litigation, or some reasonable ground for his belief that it was proper to interfere. Dealing with the evidence, his lordship expressed himself strongly upon the defendant Brisco's conduct in launching a charge of fraud against the plaintiff without inquiring as to his respectability, and he did not think it unreasonable that he should be called upon to pay the costs he had occasioned the plaintiff. Whatever the definition of maintenance might be, his lordship was of opinion that this case should fall within it, and he gave judgment for the plaintiff against the defendant Brisco for £118 and costs, and dismissed the action against the defendant Parker without costs.

Upon the application of *Jelf*, execution was stayed pending an appeal upon the money being brought into court, and the costs paid.—*Times*.

SOCIETIES.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The following circular has been issued to the members:—

In pursuance of the resolution passed at the adjourned annual general meeting, held on the 15th of July, 1881, to the effect that meetings of the society should be held in January and April, I am directed to inform you that a special general meeting of the members of the society will be held in the hall of the society on Friday, the 29th inst., at two o'clock precisely, to consider the subjects hereinafter mentioned, and of which notice has been duly given:—

Mr. Melvill Green will move:

"That, in the event of legislation being proposed as to any death duty, the council be requested to have regard to the fact that no other body and no section of the public is separately interested in the death duties, and that they be requested, therefore, to endeavour strenuously to have all details settled so as to remove all anomalies and injustice, and to create no fresh ones."

Mr. Charles Ford will ask the following questions, which stood over from the adjourned general meeting held on the 24th of July last:—

"Whether the reason for omitting from the Law Society's Calendar for 1885, the usual report of the proceedings of general meetings of the society for the preceding year, was the fact that discussions took place in the year 1884, followed by my action in the High Court, *re* the Law Club, and which ended in the winding up of the club and possession of the club premises being given to the society, and whether the council propose to include in the Calendar for 1886 the usual reports of proceedings at the general meetings in 1885, and also a list of the members of the new club, names of hon. members of the club, the names of the club committee, and the club rules."

"Whether the council intend to give the new club twelve calendar months' notice, in the manner required by the resolution of the society of the 11th of July, 1884, of the intention of the society to resume occupation of the club premises, in order that the same may be made available for the general purposes of the society, including luncheon and refreshment rooms, to be opened to all members of the society without further subscription, and with a view to affording further accommodation for law students; or, in the alternative, whether the council intend to call upon the new club to pay such a rental as the old club offered to pay on the eve of its dissolution."

And will move the following, which also stood over from the last meeting:

"That the bye-law 17a is *ultra vires* the charter, opposed to free discussion, and is hereby repealed."

"That section 8 of the Solicitors Act, 1877, the terms of which, as regards the application of the students' fees named therein, are as follows: 'All moneys paid to the society in pursuance of this Act in respect of the preliminary, intermediate, and final examinations shall be applied by the society in payment of the expenses from time to time incurred by the society with reference to such examinations, and with reference to the lectures, classes, and other teaching provided by the society from time to time for persons bound, or about to be bound, under articles of clerkship to solicitors,' is not being complied with by the society as regards the application of the moneys therein mentioned."

"That the claims of the law students of England and Wales, advanced by them at their congress in London in June last, for a better system of legal education, deserve the serious attention of this society, and the council is hereby directed to report to the next general meeting of the society to what extent such claims can be met in view of section 8 of the Solicitors Act, 1877, and this meeting is of opinion that greater inducements ought to be offered by the society to students in connection with the study of the law."

Mr. Charles Ford will also ask:

"Whether, in the next annual accounts of the society, to be published by the council, the accounts relating to the Law Society Club will be included, as required by the charter and bye-laws."

And will also move the following as a bye-law of the society, with the view of preventing the appointment of partners or members of the council to the position of paid officers of the society:

"Partners or clerks of members of the council shall not be eligible to hold any appointment connected with the society, in regard to which remuneration out of the society's funds attaches."

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The usual monthly meeting of the board of directors of this association was held at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, London, on Wednesday, the 13th inst., Mr. Edwin Hedger in the chair. The other directors present were Messrs. W. Beriah Brook, Samuel Harris (Leicester), J. H. Kays, Grinham Keen, H. Roscoe, Sidney Smith, H. S. Styan, W. Melmoth Walters, E. W. Williamson, Frederic T. Woolbert, and J. T. Scott (secretary). A sum of £245 was distributed in grants of relief, ten new members were admitted to the association, and other general business was transacted.

THE IRISH INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

On Monday last an extraordinary general meeting of the Incorporated Law Society of Ireland was held for the purpose of considering the report of the Legal Reform Committee (*ante*, p. 167). Mr. JEHU MATHEWS, vice-president, presided.

Mr. GODDARD, secretary, having read the notice convening the meeting,

Mr. JOHN SCALLAN, after referring at considerable length to the steps which led to the appointment of the Legal Reform Committee and to their resolution that it was undesirable that steps should be taken to promote the amalgamation of the professions of barrister and solicitor, said that if there was a burning desire on the part of the public to bring about an amalgamation of the two professions he could understand this body coming forward and arranging their forces so as to make the best of it, but when there was no such burning desire attached to it, when this great question was never even put to a single candidate for Parliament at the recent General Election, when Mr. Clay did not ask one, "Are you in favour of Home Rule, or are you for amalgamation?" when he was not aware that question had been put to any candidate in Ireland, he thought that under the circumstances they would not say that that question was a very important one. If that feeling did not exist, to ask them deliberately to confer the privileges of their profession upon the whole bar, not excluding the leaders of the bar, and to put themselves at the mercy of those gentlemen by competition would be nothing short of madness. He thought he had disposed of what he might call the main question, and he would be very much surprised, indeed, if the society would arrive at any other conclusion except the conclusion arrived at by the committee—that it was not desirable to promote any amalgamation. But there was one thing which the committee considered, and that was, that while it was not desirable to take steps to promote the amalgamation, it was most desirable to take steps to improve their condition in the matters mentioned in the report. Let them not waste their time on will-o'-the-wisps, but let them apply themselves to the practical state of things which now existed. He ventured to suggest that it was reasonable that there should be perfect freedom of interchange between the professions, and the grounds on which he ventured to form that opinion were these, that the students were taken from the same classes of society, that they were practically subject to the same education, and, if anything, their system was far more strict than that of the bar, and it was hard upon individuals in the professions that men should be prevented from going from one profession to another if they found they were more suited to fill positions in the other profession. The committee had reported in favour of that view. They recommended an absolute right on the part of each member of both professions of not less than five years' standing to an immediate transfer from one profession to the other, subject only to the applicant passing such an examination as will insure adequate knowledge to qualify him for the profession to which he desires to be transferred. Mr. D'Alton and Mr. Dix had both taken exception to that, and they founded their objection on the ground that their profession was a more expensive one to enter than the bar, and a more difficult one to attain, and therefore it was unreasonable to allow barristers to come into the profession on equal terms. He had always felt very strongly that it was a hardship on solicitors who found themselves better suited for the profession of advocate not to be able to go to the bar. And how could solicitors urge that without being ready to confer a corresponding privilege upon the members of the bar? The next question was as to the right of audience. Mr. Clay urged upon them that they should consider the public good. The only way to do that was to make litigation as cheap as they could make it compatibly with its efficiency. A law had already been passed enabling a solicitor to conduct a case in bankruptcy, and it was not necessary to employ barristers there, but still they were employed. But there was a large amount of other business, especially chamber business, which could be transacted by the solicitor, and there was no reason why it should not be done by him. Any business which could reasonably be done by solicitors should be done by them, and he trusted that their power would be extended by enabling them to do it. As regarded the question of solicitors appearing in actions for the recovery of sums of the amount of £50, their reason was that if a solicitor could conduct a case for that amount in an inferior court why should he

not be able to do so in the superior courts? That was the recommendation of the committee, and there was no exception taken to it. With regard to the two next recommendations, they were put forward with the view of rectifying two great anomalies. A solicitor might defend in a criminal case to the extent of cross-examining a witness, but he could not address a jury. They proposed to extend the right of audience by enabling a solicitor to address the jury. If the solicitor was allowed to defend a prisoner he should be put in just as good a position as a barrister. It was also manifestly unjust if they allowed a solicitor to act as advocate that he should be deprived of the assistance of another solicitor, and they proposed to allow two solicitors to appear and act for the same client at the same time in the same case. Practising barristers might be numbered at 400, and they divided between them appointments, some of which should be given to the solicitor profession exclusively—for instance, the office of solicitor to the Inland Revenue. If solicitors did not organize and make their claims, he felt they would never enjoy those appointments which were legitimately theirs. There was another question on which his mind was not quite satisfied. That question was the inconvenience and loss which were frequently inflicted on suitors and the solicitors' profession by the failure of barristers to appear, or by reason of their inadequate attendance on cases in which they had been retained. They would have to get the bar to co-operate with them, and it was a delicate matter. The report suggested that there should be a conference, and he hoped sincerely that such a conference would take place, and would result in something practical. If there was not some reform brought about, they might rest assured that the question would not remain quiet as heretofore. Steps would have to be taken for the purpose of better protecting public interests. At the last meeting of the Incorporated Law Society of England the same question was discussed, and it was proposed there to put the matter on the ground of contract—absolute contract—between barrister and client. Afterwards a resolution was passed that a conference should be held. He would only say that he hoped that, while they would lay the amalgamation ghost which had brought about a great deal of good by stirring them up to look for some real corporeal substance, that they would be a little more active in asserting their rights. It was sad to think that, while there were 1,200 members of the profession in Ireland, there were only 400 members of the society, and if they organized themselves as every body was now doing, he had no doubt that in a few years their profession would be in a very different position to that in which it was at present. He would move the adoption of the report *en bloc*.

Mr. NUNN suggested that Mr. Scallan should take each resolution separately.

Mr. SCALLAN assented, and moved the first resolution, which was as follows:—"That it is undesirable that steps should be taken by the Incorporated Law Society of Ireland to promote an amalgamation of the professions of barrister and solicitor."

Mr. DIX seconded the resolution.

Mr. R. KEATING CLAY opposed the resolution. He said the report of the committee was against the weight of evidence, and if the committee did not require the evidence, or intended to have decided outside of it, they should not have asked for it at all, but, having got that evidence, they should have been guided by it. He considered there should be no restriction placed upon a solicitor practising as a barrister if his client thought fit, and he would ask that the resolution should be negatived, and the question left open until a future occasion.

Mr. GERRARD said the verdict the committee had arrived at was not against the weight of evidence. The evidence showed that in Alabama, where the professions were united, in cases of difficulty two lawyers were sometimes employed. In Bavaria the professions were also amalgamated, but all lawyers could not practise in all courts, and these were facts which existed amongst themselves. In Canada the professions of barristers and solicitors were separate to the extent of there being a barristers' roll and a solicitors' roll, upon both of which the one individual usually appeared, but it was usual for a solicitor to have a partner, and sometimes three or four, and in every firm there were usually a couple of court men. The senior member of the firm usually brought the case into court, and in large cases they sometimes called in the assistance of a senior member of another firm. Was not that the system which prevailed in Ireland? In France they had three branches of the profession, but he considered their own system better than that. In Germany any lawyer could give a brief to another. Having touched upon the systems prevailing in Louisiana, Massachusetts, and Norway, Mr. Gerrard said the report from New York shewed that they did not know any other system but the amalgamated one there; if they did it was very probable they would prefer it. In New Zealand, too, the heads of the large firms did the court work. He held that in every case in which they had received replies the verdict given by them was not inconsistent with the evidence, and he, for one, would object to being bound by that evidence even if it was against him, for they had a right to use their own sense in dealing with evidence. He asked those around him, who were men of experience, if they were not in their offices to consult with their clients, would their business be well done? It would be utterly impossible to have solicitors going into court and moving cases, and also being in their offices to consult. Such a course would lead to their joining in firms, one member of which would have to remain in the office while the other went to court.

Mr. HANBURY GROGHEGAN pointed out that Victoria, with an experience of both professions, was greatly in favour of amalgamation, and he thought in Ireland they should follow the lead of English-speaking countries rather than take example from foreign countries such as France. What they should have was a roll of barristers and a roll of solicitors on which almost every man could have his name. The solicitor

still remained a solicitor, and a barrister would still remain a barrister, unless they desired to change, then it would be competent for them to do so.

On the motion of Mr. ROSENTHAL, seconded by Mr. SHANNON, the meeting was adjourned until the 8th of February.

OBITUARY.

MR. JOHN BLACHFORD.

Mr. John Blachford, solicitor (the head of the firm of Blachford, Riches, & Wood), of 25, Abchurch-lane, who was nearly, if not quite, the oldest solicitor in the City of London, died on the 4th inst. at the age of ninety-four. Mr. Blachford was born in 1790. He was admitted a solicitor in 1818, and he had been for over sixty-five years in practice, and had a large business. He was at the time of his death associated in partnership with Mr. John Riches and Mr. Edwin Wood. He was for more than forty years vestry clerk of the parish of St. James's, Aldgate, and on his resignation of that appointment he was presented by the parishioners with an illuminated address, embodying a vote of thanks for his long official services. Mr. Blachford was buried at the Fulham Cemetery on the 9th inst.

MR. HENRY CHARLEWOOD.

Mr. Henry Charlewood, solicitor, died recently at his residence in Crumpsall-crescent, Manchester, having long been in failing health. Mr. Charlewood was the son of the Rev. Charles Benjamin Charlewood, of Oakhill, Staffordshire, his mother having been the eldest daughter of Mr. Thomas Phillips, of Sedgeley, and granddaughter of Sir George Richard Phillips, Bart. He was for several years in practice at Manchester, first as a member of the firm of Cunliffe, Charlewood, & Bury, and more recently in partnership with Mr. Henry Mere Ormerod. Mr. Charlewood was for many years a member of the Manchester Board of Guardians, and he was successively vice-chairman and chairman of that body. He was also chairman of the Swinton Industrial Schools, and he represented the guardians on the committee of the Barnes Samaritan Charity. The Sharp-street Ragged School was dependent chiefly on his fostering care and unstinting liberality, and the greater part of the cost of rebuilding the school was borne by him. The department of his self-imposed labours which Mr. Charlewood undertook with singular zest and sustained for many years with unflinching devotion was, says the *Manchester Guardian*, the educational portion of the duties incident to his office. "Here his tender and benevolent nature found ample and congenial occupation. He made himself personally acquainted with the children in the workhouse and schools, surrendered to them time that he could ill spare from his professional engagements, and overtaxed the resources of a delicate constitution and a weakly frame. He vigilantly watched over the mental and moral progress of his juvenile clients, and visited them when they were out at service or apprenticed to trades. Their character and conduct were the dearest objects of his solicitude. At the Crumpsall Workhouse he spent many hours weekly in reading to and conversing with the younger inmates, and thus imparted to them an amount of instruction and of moral and religious culture which is impossible to over-estimate." Mr. Charlewood erected a boys' school at Blackley at his own expense, and also a club-room at Lower Crumpsall, and he was a liberal supporter of most of the religious and charitable institutions in the district. His son, Mr. Edward Phillips Charlewood, was admitted a solicitor in 1876, and practises at Manchester. Mr. Charlewood was buried at Checkley, Staffordshire, on the 13th inst.

MR. ALFRED HANSON.

Mr. Alfred Hanson, barrister, controller of legacy and succession duties, died at his residence, 1, Upper Westbourne-terrace, on the 6th inst., in his seventieth year. Mr. Hanson was the eldest son of Mr. Joshua Fletcher Hanson, of Backwell, Somersetshire, and was born in 1816. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Hilary Term, 1843, and he practised for many years in the Court of Chancery. He was the author of a treatise on "The Acts relating to Probate, Legacy, and Succession Duties," and he was for several years a revising barrister for the metropolis. He was junior counsel to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue in legacy and succession duty cases, from 1853 till 1865, in which year he was appointed controller of legacy and succession duties of the Inland Revenue Office, and he held that post until his death. Mr. Hanson was married in 1848 to the daughter of the Rev. John Clarke, and he became a widower in 1876.

MR. JOHN BULLEN SHEPHERD.

Mr. John Bullen Shepherd, solicitor (of the firm of Harward, Shepherd, & Mills), of Stourbridge, died on the 28th ult. Mr. Shepherd was educated at the Stourbridge Grammar School. He served his articles with Mr. W. Hunt, of Stourbridge, and he was admitted a solicitor in 1848. He had an extensive practice, and he was a perpetual commissioner for Worcester-shire. He was at the time of his death associated in partnership with Mr. Gainsborough Harward, and with Mr. Harry Mills. Mr. Shepherd was president of the Stourbridge Liberal Association. He was buried at Ambicote Church on the 31st ult.

LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. JAMES REDFOORD BULWER, Q.C., who has been appointed a Master in Lunacy, in succession to Mr. Henry John Lowndes Graham, who has been appointed Clerk of the Parliaments, is the eldest son of the Rev. James Bulwer, rector of Hunworth, Norfolk, and was born in 1820. He is an M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1847. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1864. He formerly practised on the Norfolk Circuit, but after the last re-arrangement of the assizes he became a member of the South-Eastern Circuit. Mr. Bulwer was M.P. for Ipswich in the Conservative interest from 1874 till 1880, and for Cambridgeshire from 1881 till November last. He was recorder of Ipswich from 1861 till 1866, when he was appointed recorder of Cambridge. He is a bencher of the Inner Temple, of which society he was treasurer in 1880, and a magistrate for Norfolk, and one of the chairmen of quarter sessions for that county. Mr. Bulwer is common law editor of the *Law Reports*, and he was formerly Lieutenant-colonel of the Inns of Court Rifle Volunteers.

Mr. HUGH COWIE, Q.C., has been appointed Secretary to the Royal Commission upon the Education Acts. Mr. Cowie is the eldest son of Mr. Alexander Cowie, of Auchterless, Aberdeenshire. He was educated at King's College, London, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated as a wrangler in 1851. He was called to the bar at Gray's-inn in Hilary Term, 1862, and he is a member of the South-Eastern Circuit. He was an assistant boundary commissioner under the Reform Act of 1867, and he acted as secretary to the Criminal Code Commission. He was a commissioner for inquiring into corrupt practices in the city of Oxford in 1880, and he became a Queen's Counsel in 1882. Mr. Cowie is prosecuting counsel to the Post Office at the Central Criminal Court, and a bencher of Gray's-inn. He was appointed recorder of the boroughs of Maldon and Saffron Walden in 1873, and chancellor of the diocese of Durham in 1876.

Mr. JOHN BISHOP, stipendiary magistrate at Merthyr Tydvil, has been appointed Judge of the Mid Wales County Court Circuit in succession to Mr. Brynmor Jones, transferred to the Gloucestershire Circuit, vacant by the death of the late Judge Charles Sumner. Judge Bishop is the eldest son of Mr. Charles Bishop, of Llandovery, and was born in 1830. He was educated at Caius College, Cambridge. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Easter Term, 1853, and he formerly practised on the South Wales and Chester Circuit. He has been stipendiary magistrate at Merthyr Tydvil since 1876, and he is also a magistrate for Monmouthshire, Glamorganshire, Brecknockshire, and Carmarthenshire.

Mr. THEODORE HOYLE, solicitor, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, has been elected Coroner for that city, in succession to his father, the late Mr. John Theodore Hoyle. Mr. Hoyle had for many years acted as his father's deputy. He was admitted a solicitor in 1862, and he is in partnership with Mr. Joseph Aynsley Davidson Shipley. He is also deputy coroner for the Southern Division of Northumberland.

Mr. EDMUND CRESSWELL PEELE, solicitor, of Shrewsbury, has been appointed by the Earl of Bradford, Lord Lieutenant of Shropshire, to the office of Clerk of the Peace for that county, in succession to his elder brother, the late Mr. George De Courcy Peele. Mr. E. C. Peele is the son of Mr. Joshua John Peele, solicitor, of Shrewsbury. He has been for several years county treasurer, town clerk of Shrewsbury, and clerk to the magistrates for the Upper Munslow Division of Shropshire. He was admitted a solicitor in 1868.

Mr. THOMAS CHALONER SMITH, barrister, has been elected Chairman of Quarter Sessions at Devizes, in succession to Mr. Ralph Ludlow Lopes, resigned. Mr. Smith is the eldest son of Mr. Thomas Smith, of Ramsbury Manor, Wiltshire, and was born in 1820. He was educated at Harrow, and he was formerly Lieutenant-colonel of the 11th Hussars. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1843. He is a magistrate for Wiltshire, and since 1875 he has been chairman of the second court at the Devizes Quarter Sessions.

His Honour Judge CAMILLE FELIX DESIRE CAILLARD has been elected Chairman of the Second Court at the Devizes Quarter Sessions. Judge Caillard is the only son of Mr. Camille Timothé Caillard, and was born in 1822. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1845. He formerly practised in the Court of Chancery, and in 1859 he was appointed judge of county courts for Circuit No. 52. Judge Caillard is a magistrate for Wiltshire and Somersetshire, and a deputy lieutenant for the former county.

Mr. JOSEPH HENRY MOORE, barrister, has been appointed Professor of Law by the Irish Incorporated Law Society. Mr. Moore was called to the bar in Ireland in 1879, and he is a member of the North-West Circuit.

Mr. PENDRELL J. CHARLES, solicitor and notary public (of the firm of Charles & Evans), of Neath, Glamorganshire, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. ERNEST HENRY WYLES, solicitor (of the firm of Clarkson, Greenwell, & Wyles), of 24, Carter-lane, Doctors' Commons, London, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. JAMES ROBERT HARRIES JONES, solicitor, of Oldham, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

PARTNERSHIPS DISSOLVED.

THOMAS CLONEY O'KELLY and FRANCIS HENRY BOWEN, solicitors (O'Kelly & Bowen), Royal Courts-chambers, 70, 71, and 72, Chancery-lane. Dec. 31, 1885. The said Thomas Cloney O'Kelly will in future carry on the said business at the same address on his own account, under the style of O'Kelly & Co.

EDWARD GEORGE SIMPSON, WILLIAM LAMB HOCKIN, and HENRY CHARLES RABY, solicitors (Simpson, Hockin, & Raby), Manchester. Dec. 31, 1885. [Gazette, Jan. 8.]

ARTHUR BUCKLEY and SAMUEL ARTHUR NEWALL, solicitors (Buckley, Son, & Newall), Ashton-under-Lyne, and 1, St. James-square, Manchester. Dec. 31, 1885. The business will in future be carried on by the said Samuel Arthur Newall, on his own account, under the style of Buckley, Son, & Newall, at Ashton-under-Lyne, and 1, St. James-square, Manchester, aforesaid.

JOSEPH CLIFTON THOMPSON and CECIL THOMPSON, solicitors (J. C. & C. Thompson), Workington, Cumberland, solicitors. Nov. 19, 1885. [Gazette, Jan. 12.]

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	APPEAL COURT No. 1.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	V. C. BAON.	Mr. Justice KAY.
Mon., Jan. 18	Mr. Pugh	Mr. Roe	Mr. Lavie	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday... 19	Lavie	Clowes	Pugh	Ward
Wednesday... 20	Beal	Koe	Lavie	Pemberton
Thursday... 21	Leach	Clowes	Pugh	Ward
Friday... 22	King	Koe	Lavie	Pemberton
Saturday... 23	Farrer	Clowes	Pugh	Ward
		Mr. Justice CHITTY.	Mr. Justice NORTH.	Mr. Justice PEARSON.
Monday, Jan. 18	Mr. Carrington	Mr. Leach	Mr. King	Mr. Farrer
Tuesday... 19	Jackson	Beal	King	Farrer
Wednesday... 20	Carrington	Leach	King	Farrer
Thursday... 21	Jackson	Beal	King	Farrer
Friday... 22	Carrington	Leach	King	Farrer
Saturday... 23	Jackson	Beal	King	Farrer

COURT OF APPEAL.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1886.

(Continued from page 171.)

APPEALS FOR HEARING.

(Set down to January 2nd, inclusive.)

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION, THE PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (PROBATE AND DIVORCE), AND THE COUNTY PALATINE AND STANNARIES COURTS.

Construction of Will In re R Thompson, decd, Tweed v Wilmott app of pit from order of V C Bacon refusing application for division of surplus July 2

The United Telephone Co, lmd, v Donohoe app of pit Co from judgt of V C Bacon July 3

In re Atkinson, decd, Atkinson v Bruce, and Settled Land Act, 1882 app of pits against declaration of Mr Justice Pearson that appt tenant for life only July 7

Mason v Mason app of pit from Judgment of Mr. Justice Chitty and app mtn by order July 10

Dawson v Dawson, Dawson v Poole, Dawson v Milne app of defts J W Dawson and Wife from judgt of Mr Justice Pearson July 10

Babin v Hughes app of deft Edward Edwards from judgt of Mr Justice Kay July 11

Horden v Faulkner app of pit from judgt of Mr Justice Field sitting as an additional judge of the Chancery Division for Mr Justice Chitty July 17

In re Robert Francis Jenner, decd, Collier v Jenner, Jenner v Jenner app of deft H Jenner from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty to vary chief clerk's certificate July 18

In re Robert Francis Jenner, decd, Collier v Jenner, Jenner v Jenner app of deft Gertrude Jenner, spinster, from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty to vary chief clerk's certificate July 18

Miles v New Zealand Alford Estates Co, lmd app of deft Co from judgt of Mr Justice North July 20

In re The Aburdare and Plymouth Co, lmd, and Co's Acts (White and Shaxson's claim) app of the Assets Co from order of Mr Justice Chitty July 20

In re H C Tunnicliffe, decd Thornehill v Tunnicliffe app of deft Annie O Tunnicliffe from order of Mr Justice Chitty July 23

In re applictn of G F Lyndon (trading as W A Lyndon) for registration of Trade Marks Nos 39,939 and 39,942, and J Bedford & Sons opposition thereto and Patents, &c, Act app of G F Lyndon (trading, &c) from refusal of Mr Justice Pearson to register trade mark July 27

Scott v Pace app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice North July 28

In re The Duke of Marlborough's Settlement Trusts The Duke of Marlborough v Hon E Marjoribanks app of Hon E Marjoribanks, guardian of infant Marquis of Blandford from order of Mr Justice Chitty July 30

Knowles v The Bradford Old Bank, ld app of defts from judgment of V C Bacon July 31

In re H Wheatley, decd In re M Wheatley, decd Smith v Spence app of Dora Ann Davison, widow, and anr from order of Mr Justice Chitty on fur con Aug 4

In re Joseph Wood, decd, and In re The Guardians of the Poor of the Parishes of St Margaret and St John the Evangelist, Westminster and Downing at Public Offices, &c, Act, 1885, and other Acts app of H M Commrs for Works and Buildings from order of V C Bacon as to costs Aug 9

In re a Contract for Sale of Real Estates between Augusta Terry and James White and V & P Act, 1874 (compensation for mis-description) app of the vendor from order of V C Bacon Aug 6

In re Bruin, decd Bruin v Mills app of pit from order of Mr Justice Pearson on fur con Aug 7

Fleet v The Managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District app of pits from judgment of Mr Justice Pearson Aug 8

Young v The Mynyddygareg and Kidwelly Ry and Lime Co ld app of pit from judgt of Mr Justice Kay Aug 10

In re T L Openshaw, decd Duckworth v Openshaw app of defts Geo Bromlow and Wife from order of V C Bacon on fur con Aug 10

Clover v The Wilts & Western Benefit Building Society app of deft Society from refusal of V C Bacon to vary Chief Clerk's certificate Aug 11

In re R F Jenner, decd Collier v Jenner Jenner v Jenner app of Gertrude Jenner, spinster, from orders of Mr Justice Chitty, dated July 10 and Aug 4 Aug 11

Ward v The Sittingbourne & Sheerness Ry Co app of pit from order of Mr Justice Pearson for payment consequent upon enquiry and account Aug 11

In re Crawley decd Acton v Crawley app of deft Jno Crawley from judgt of Mr Justice Pearson on originating summons Aug 13

In re Samuel Swire, decd Mellor v Swire app of Edwina Storer, having conduct, &c, from order of V C Bacon on fur con and summons to vary Aug 14

(Divorce) Mary Parry v Samuel Parry app of Mary Parry from part of the judgt of Mr Justice Butt limiting costs to money paid into court and refusing full costs Aug 14

In re John Bozward, decd, Bozward v Bozward app of deft J L Bozward from orders of Mr Justice Pearson disallowing claims against testator's estate Aug 15

In re an application of Messrs Charlton and Dugdale, No 7,269, and Trade Mark Registration Act, 1875, and Patents, &c, Act, 1883—opposition of Billington Bros app of Messrs Billington Bros from refusal of Mr Justice Pearson to expunge trade mark from register Aug 15

In re Trade Mark No 12,175, Class 18, registered by Atkins' Filter and Engineering Co, lmd, and Patents, &c, Act, 1883 app of Messrs Lipcombe & Co from refusal of V C Bacon to order registration Aug 21

Pugh v Jones app of pits from order of V C Bacon refusing application to vary chief clerk's certificate with costs Aug 24

In re Geo Perton, decd Pearson and ora v Attorney-General app of W A Whitaker and Wife (parties attending, &c), from order of Mr Justice Chitty disallowing claim and declaring for illegitimacy Aug 24

In the Matter of two applications, Nos 34,746, and 34,747, by W Creed, Arnold Thomas and Edward Craddock, exors of R S Hudson, decd, for the registration of Trade Mark, and Patent, &c, Act, 1883 app of Chas Lowe and anr (trading as T C Calvert & Co) from an order of V C Bacon giving liberty to proceed with registration Aug 26

In re Contract for Sale of Ground Rents secured upon Houses in St Andrew, Teal, and Viaduct streets, Bethnal Green, decd 4th March, 1885, made between Henry A Tuck and S Cuff, and V & P Act, 1874 app of H A Tuck from order of Mr Justice Pearson that requisition as to title not sufficiently answered Aug 26

In re Geo Bolton, decd Brown v Bolton app of deft J A Bolton, an infant, by guardian ad litem, from order of Mr Justice Kay as to title to proceeds of residuary estate Aug 26

In re Trade Mark, No 28,942, of Christian Christiansen and Patent &c Act, 1883 app of the Nitdals Taendstfabrik of Christiansa, Norway, from order of Mr Justice Chitty dismissing appln to rectify register Aug 28

De Caux v Skipper Tee v De Caux app of deft Marianne Tee from judgt of V C Bacon for foreclosure Sept 2

Divorce (heard in camera) Doddrell otherwise Bond v Bond Bond v Bond and Cole (consolidated) app of petr in 1st suit and respnt and co-respnt in 2nd suit from judgt of Mr Justice Butt dismissing petr of nullity and pronouncing decree nisi for dissolution Sept 2

Divorce H S E Reeves, petr v Amy Capel Reeves, respnt (Ernest Fryer and ora co-respnt) app of petr from Mr Justice Butt on 11th August, 1885, making no order as to respnt property in settlement and reversion, and for order to make re-settlement for benefit of children Sept 4

In re Cartago Land and Co's Acts app of petr C E Winwood-Smith from Mr Justice A L Smith, sitting as Vacation Judge for Mr Justice Kay, refusing winding up order Sept 8

Williamson v North Staffordshire Ry Co Biggs v North Staffordshire Ry Co app of deft W Steyd from judgt of V C Bacon Sept 9

In re W S Edgar, decd Hale v Edgar app of defts (other than E Clotworthy, Robert Clotworthy and Lewis) Edgar from order of Mr Justice Kay Sept 11

In re Patents Designs and T M Act, 1883, and Trade Marks Nos 28,402, 35,188, and 39,710 registered by Richard Hayward & Sons app of Hayward & Sons from order of Mr Justice Kay expunging T M 39,710 from register (S O till after the trial of Hayward v Hayward Sept 14

Watson v Cave Allen v Cave Tyler v Rat app of John Procter from order of Mr Justice Chitty upon petition Sept 19

In re Hadden's Patent and In re Boulit's Patent Designs and T M Act, 1883 Walker v The Hydro Carbon Syndicate ld app of Robert Walker from order of V C Bacon dismissing petition Sept 24

In re The New Callao ld and Co's Acts, 1862 and 1867 app of the Co from winding up order made by Mr Justice A L Smith sitting as Vacation Judge for Mr Justice Kay (security for £25 ordered Dec 11) Oct 2

In re The West Callao Gold Mining Co and Co's Acts app of the Co from winding up order made by Mr Justice A L Smith sitting as Vacation Judge (security for £25 ordered Dec 11) Oct 2

In re James Atkins's Voluntary Settlement Trusts and Susannah M Chadwick's Share of Bank Annuities and 10 & 11 Viet c 96 app of Susannah M Chadwick by next friend &c from V C Bacon dismissing appln to vary C C Certificate (security for £15 ordered Nov 2) Oct 13

In re The South Harbour Smelting and Rolling Works ld & Co's Acts app of W St vens (Petitioner) from order of Mr Justice Mathew sitting as Vacation Judge for Mr Justice Chitty Oct 16

Croydon v The Prudential Loan & Dist Co ld app of deft Co from judgt of Mr Justice Pearson Oct 16

In re Harvey's Settlement, Harvey v Harvey app of defts W Harvey and anr from Mr Justice Pearson Oct 21

In re Trade-Mark, "Diamond Cast Steel" No 5,917, registered by Walter Spencer and Co, Midland Steel Works, Rotherham, and T M Registration Acts app of Walter Spencer and Co from order of Mr Justice Chitty Oct 22

- In re Ellen S Snow, decd, Snow v Poole app of deft George Poole from order of Mr Justice Chitty on fur con Oct 29
- In re Thos Dixon, decd, Dixon v Smith app of deft Rev H V Daly from order of V C Bacon Nov 3
- In re Aaron Smith, decd, Day v Bonami app of deft R A E Day from order of Mr Justice Kay on fur con Nov 4
- Walker v James app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice North Nov 5
- Smith v Davies app of deft Annie Davies from judgt of Mr Justice Chitty for foreclosure Nov 5
- Downes v Falcon Engine and Car Works, lmd app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Day for Mr Justice Chitty Nov 6
- Mayor, &c, of Plymouth v Martin app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Kay Nov 7 (security for £20 ordered Nov 4)
- In re Fisher, decd, Fisher v Robinson app of T J Fisher and ors (having liberty, &c) from order of Mr Justice Chitty on fur con Nov 10
- Sim v Newton app of deft H R Newton in person from order of Mr Justice Chitty on fur con Nov 10
- Paget v Clagett app of deft C D Lockwood and anr from judgt of Mr Justice Chitty Nov 10
- In re Lewis, decd, Lewis, an Infant, v Williams, Widow app of David James and Wife from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty to vary order on fur con and mtn to vary Nov 11
- In re The General Marine Salvage Co, lmd, and Co's Acts in voluntary Liquidation, Copley & Co's Claim app of liquidator from order of Mr Justice Kay, allowing Creditors' Claim Nov 18
- In re the Argyll Coal and Canal Co, lmd, and Co's Acts (Cases of Hacking and ore) app of Hacking and ors from order of Mr Justice Kay placing on List of Contributors Nov 18
- In re The West Worthing Hotel Co, lmd, and Co's Acts (Petition of F Battock) app of petitioner from V C Bacon dismissing petition Nov 19
- In re The Bristol Joint Stock Bank, lmd, and Co's Acts (Petition of Isabella Todd, widow) app of petitioner from order of V C Bacon dismissing petition to wind up Co Nov 20
- Taylor v Lord Mostyn app of Lady Mostyn and ors from refusal of V C Bacon (postponed to 2nd appeal by consent) Aug 10
- Taylor v Lord Mostyn app of Lady Mostyn and ors from order of V C Bacon dismissing sums to vary Chief Clerk's certificate Nov 23
- In re The Cheshire Banking Co and Co's Acts, and In re Juff, decd. app of W Muntlebury and ors from order of Mr Justice Kay Nov 28
- In re The Mutual Society and Co's Acts, Grimwade v The Mutual Society, The Mutual Society v Wallingford app of deft John Wallingford from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty Nov 28
- Harris v De Pinna app of pls from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty to restrain rebuilding—Transferred to General List as Final Appeal, by order Dec 1
- Norton (now Baron Granley) v Johnstone (Petition) app of G G C Norton (having liberty, &c) against order of Mr Justice Pearson letting into possession Dec 2
- Wilson on behalf of the Copyholders of Holmes Cultram, Cumberland, v Barnes and others, and the Attorney-Gen app of the Attorney-Gen from judgt of Mr Justice Pearson Dec 3
- re W Smith, decd, Smith v New app of plt from order of Mr Justice Chitty on fur con Dec 4
- Schrieber v Dinkel app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice North Dec 5
- Fullwood v Fullwood app of pls from judgt of V C Bacon Dec 8
- Paget v Clagett app of deft Thomas Kemble from judgt of Mr Justice Chitty Dec 8
- In re Whitley Partners, lmd and Co's Acts (Philip Callan's Case) app of Philip Callan from refusal of V C Bacon Dec 8
- In re Robert Dundas Strong, a Solicitor, Ex parte Vaux app of R D Strong from order of Mr Justice Kay striking off Rolls Dec 8
- In re the Bristol Joint Stock Bank, lmd, and Co's Acts Petition of Richardson and anr app of petitioner from order of V C Bacon dismissing petition to wind up Co Dec 9
- Radcliffe v Payne app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Kay Dec 11
- Lamb v Pollen app of deft W H Pollen from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty to vary C C Certificate Dec 11
- In re W H Newton, decd, Newton v Birkett app of plt from order of V C Bacon on fur con Dec 14
- Taylor v Blakelock app of plt from judgt of V C Bacon Dec 14
- In re The Carta Para Gold Mining Co, lmd, and Co's Acts (Claim of J F Lovering, Trustee in Bankruptcy of W R Horneastle) app of J F Lovering from order of Mr Justice Pearson Dec 16
- Black v Brown app of plt from judgt of V C Bacon Dec 16
- Blake v Gale app of plt from judgt of V C Bacon Dec 17
- Green v Paterson and In re J M Green, decd, and Trustee Act, 1850 app of Infant plt Mr R B Green, by next friend, from order of V C Hall (leave to appeal granted Dec 12) Dec 18
- In re Bertha C Hochays, Spinster, decd, Fieke v Calmady app of deft V P Calmady from order of V C Bacon Dec 21
- In re James Hickey, decd, Hickey v Colmer app of Gawton Mining Co, lmd, and deft Colmer from order of Mr Justice Kay, varying C C Certificate Dec 28

1886.

In re Lesman, decd, Darley v Tennant app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Pearson Jan 2

From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions in the Chancery Division.
Separate List.

1885.

- Gooch v The London Banking Association lmd app of dfts from Mr Justice Pearson restraining distribution of assets by liquidator July 27 80 till Jan 12 (Probate) G Willis v Earl Beauchamp and A F Coe app of G Willis from order of Mr Justice Butt on summons dismissing action as frivolous and vexatious Aug 1
- (Divorce) Gandy v Gandy app of Maurice Gandy from order of Sir Jas Hannen directing applicant to file better affidavit in answer to ptn for permanent alimony Dec 8
- Concha v Marietta and other acts app of M A Concha and wife (having liberty to stene) from order of V C Bacon on ptn for payment out Dec 14
- The London and Blackwall Ry Co v Cross app of dfts from order of Mr Justice Chitty restraining taking further steps in arbitration Dec 15

- Medcalf, Girling & Co v Medcalf & Co app of defendant from order of Mr Justice Pearson restraining issue of labels, &c, referring to pits' firm Dec 19
- Leitch v Abbott & Co app of plt from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty to order better answers to interrogatories Dec 21
- In re Thos Symons, decd Betts v Betts app of Rev H W Webb-Peploe from refusal of V C Bacon to discharge order for service of judgt in action Dec 24
- In re John Glanville, decd Ellis v Johnson app of plt from order of V C Bacon for payment of taxed costs of John's income Dec 24
- Bowring, Jamieson & Co v Roberts & ors app of dft Walter Roberts from order of Mr Justice Pearson for delivery of particulars of selected instances of Fraud relied upon Dec 29

1886.

- In re Matthew Todd, decd Todd v Newsome app of plt from Mr Justice Pearson dismissing Interlocutory application for Sale in Partition act upon admissions Jan 2

Appeals from the County Palatine Court of Lancaster.
From Final Orders and Judgments.

1884.

- Liverpool District Sharp v Dawson app of dfts from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor dated Oct 31, 1884 Dec 1

1885.

- In re Blackburn and District Benefit Building Soc & Co's Acts and 6 & 7 Wm 4, c 32, and Lancaster Acts, 1850-1854 (W. Holland's claim) app of Official Liquidator from order of the Vice Chancellor, dated 19 Jan, 1885 Feb 17
- Local Board of Farnworth, County of Lancaster, v Compton app of pls from the judgt of the Vice Chancellor, dated 5 Nov, 1884 April 24
- The Dunkenhagh Colliery Co, lmd, v Pickers app of plt Co from judgt of the Vice Chancellor, dated 31 March, 1885 May 15
- Lee (pauper) v Williams app of plt from part of the judgt of the Vice Chancellor, dated Jan 15, 1885, and notice of contention by defts June 5
- In re a Contract dated Jan 20, 1885, between Messrs Darbishire and anr, agents for the Co-operative Wholesale Society, lmd, as vendors and George Kershaw as purchaser of hereditaments in Danzic street and Fisher street, Manchester, and V & P Act, 1850-1854 app of George Kershaw from order of the Vice Chancellor setting aside objections to title June 10
- The Liverpool Grain Elevator Co, lmd, v Brice app of pls from judgt of the Vice Chancellor, dated May 13, 1885 July 1
- In re Jas Schofield and Sons, lmd, and Co's Acts and Chancery Lancaster Acts app of J B Whitworth and anr from order of the Vice Chancellor, dated June 19, 1885 July 10
- In re John Fletcher, decd Faulkner v Farrar app of plt from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor dated June 22, 1885 Aug 19
- In re H & S Johnson, decd Johnson v Hodge app of deft John Johnson from judgt of Vice-Chancellor dated Aug 10, 1885 Sept 16
- The Chamber Colliery Co lmd v Hopwood app of plt from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor dated June 22, 1885 Sept 22
- In re John Dickinson, decd Dickinson v Pritchard app of dft Pritchard from refusal of the Vice-Chancellor to vary Report of Registrar Dec 4
- E Eburd & Co v Gassier and Baume app of dfts from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor dated July 22, 1885 Dec 18
- Schofield v Vause app of dfts from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor dated Nov 25, 1885 Dec 19
- In re Elizabeth Hughes, decd Matheson v Roberts app of dft from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor dated Dec 10, 1885 Dec 22

N.B.—The County Palatine Appeals as the dates of setting down are reached in the General and Separate Lists are set aside and taken on the first Thursday in every sitting, and afterwards on the first Thursday in the following months during the sittings.

N.B.—During Hilary Sittings Palatine Appeals will be taken on the following days, viz:—

Thursday, January 14.
Thursday, February 4.
Thursday, March 4.
Thursday, April 1.

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH AND PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY (ADMIRALTY) DIVISIONS.

(Continued from page 171.)

For Hearing.

1885.

- The Queen on the prosecution of the Corp of Croydon v The Croydon and Norwood Tramways Co (Q B Crown side) app of the prosecutors from the Lord Chief Justice and Lord Justice Fry discharging nisi for mandamus to relay road Aug 7
- Contract for Rolling Stock Brown, Marshalls, & Co v Antony Gibbs and Sons app of pls from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial in Middlesex Aug 7
- Damages for personal injury Juggins v The G W Ry Co app of plt from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial with a jury in Middlesex Aug 8
- Forfeiture of shares Simmons and ors (on behalf of selves and other shareholders in West Devon Great Consols Mines) v Phillips app of pls from judgt of Mr Justice A L Smith at trial Aug 8
- Davies v Kerfoot and anr app of dft J Kerfoot from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen at trial Aug 10
- Ship Amsterdam Bencherdorf, Berger, & Co v Owners of Amsterdam app of pls from judgt of the President, dated Aug 3, 1885 (without assessors) Aug 10
- Savary, Young, & Co v Priestman and Co app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Manisty at trial and dft's notice of contention on appl Aug 12
- Toye v Moore app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Day on claim and counter claim at trial in Middlesex Aug 12
- Easterbrook & anr v The Great Western Ry Co app of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Wills at trial in Middlesex without a jury Aug 12
- Wostenholm & anr v Sheffield Union Banking Co lmd (Sheffield District Registry) app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial at Leeds without a jury Aug 14
- The Ocean Steam Shipping Co v Anderson Tritton & Co app of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial Aug 17
- Rawlins v Stevenson & ors app of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial at Warwick Assizes Aug 20
- The Hydraulic Engineering Co lmd v J Spencer & Sons app of deft from judgt of

the Lord Chief Justice on claim and counter claim at trial without a jury Aug 20

Fox v MacAndrew app of dft from judgt of J R Bulwer Esq Q C at trial at Chelmsford Aug 21

F H Lloyd & Co v Mowatt (trading at Milford Haven as the Castle Steel and Iron Works) app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice A L Smith at trial at Birmingham without a jury on claim and counter claim Sept 8

Elworthy v Jones app of pltt from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial at Bristol Sept 24

The Queen on the prosecution of The Acton Local Board v T C C Essex (Q B Crown Side) app of The Acton Local Board from Justices Mathew and Day discharging nisi for certiorari to remove inquisition for compensation Oct 19

Marine Insurance Short and anr v Clark and ors app of dft from judgment of Mr Justice Stephen at trial at Swansea Nov 12

Money lent—Accounts Lloyd v Williams app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen at Swansea, waterworks reference to Official Referee Nov 13

Albiston v Symonds app of pltt from judgt of Mr Justice Wills at trial at Manchester Nov 18

Bunch and Wife v The G W Railway Co (Q B Crown Side) app of plts from judgt of Justices Day and A L Smith reversing judgt of Judge of Marylebone County Court Nov 24

Moore v The Lambeth Waterworks Co app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Day, with damages, at trial in Middlesex Nov 24

Arrears of Salary Pearce v Foster and ors app of pltt from judgt of Mr Justice Grove at trial Nov 24

Rowlands v Rowlands app of pltt from judgt of Mr Justice Denman at trial at Carmarthen Assizes Nov 25

Negligence M R Meyer and Co v Phillips and anr app of dfts from part of judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial Nov 27

Learoyd v The Consolidated Credit and Mortgage Corporation Ltd and ors app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Field at trial Nov 28

(Detention of Furniture) Gattie v Slater app of pltt in person from judgt of Mr Justice Field in Middlesex, without a jury Nov 30

Damage to Ship Anderson and ors v River Tame Commissioners app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial at Newcastle Dec 1

Axe Boxes Gordon v Forder and Co Ltd app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Field at trial Dec 3

Daniels & Co v Hoare app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Denman at trial Dec 4

Copyright—Photograph Cooper (admix &c) v E Gregson and Son app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial in Middlesex with a jury Dec 4

Settled Property—Recovery Walker v Mahon app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial at Liverpool Dec 5

Damages Thompson v Lee app of pltt from judgt of Mr Justice Denman at trial Dec 8

Breach of Contract Westwood v Conning app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial in Middlesex without a jury Dec 10

Paine v Matthews and anr app of dfts from judgt of Justices Mathew and A L Smith on special case Dec 15

Breach of Covenant Girard v Nance app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial in Middlesex Dec 18

McMann v Greenwood (Q B Crown Side) app of pltt from the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Mathew reversing judgt of Judge of Southwark County Court Dec 18

Hamilton, Fraser & Co v The Thames and Mersey Marine Insurance Co Ltd app of dfts from judgt of Justices Mathew and A L Smith on special case Dec 21

Murdoch v Funduklian app of pltt from judgt of Baron Pollock and Justices Manisty and Hawkins reversing judgt of Mr Justice A L Smith at trial at Manchester Dec 23

Armstrong v Milburn app of pltt from Justices Mathew and A L Smith reversing judgt of Mr Justice Day for pltt at trial Dec 23

1886.

Pandorf & Co v Hamilton, Frazer & Co app of pltt from judgt of Lord Justice Lopes at trial at Liverpool Jan 1

Houlder Bros & Co v The Merchants' Marine Insurance Co Ltd app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Field at trial Jan 1

FROM PROBATE, DIVORCE, & ADMIRALTY DIVISION. (ADMIRALTY).

For Hearing

With Nautical Assessors.

1885.

Ships Claudia & Polam (damage) Stevens Mawson & Goss v Edward Jordan Hough & ors app of pltt from the judgt of the President dated Dec 19 1884 March 18

Ship Newbattle (damage) Owners of Louise Marie and ors v Owners of Newbattle and freight app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated Feb 11, 1885 March 19

Ship Hartlepool (salvage) Alfred Stuart and ors, Owners, Master, and Crew of Triton v Owners of the Hartlepool, cargo and freight app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated March 31, 1885 April 1

Ship Admiral Moorsom (damage) Owners of Santa Clara v L & N W Ry Co, Owners of the SS Admiral Moorsom app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated Feb 24, 1885 April 11

Ship Ebor (damage) Owners of Telesilla v Owners of Ebor app of plts from judgt of the President, dated April 30, 1885 May 19

Ship Egyptian Monarch—Damage Owners of Cochon and cargo v Owners of Egyptian Monarch and freight app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated May 9, 1885 June 9

Ship Rask—Damage Hillman and ors v Owners of Rask and freight app of dfts from judgt of the President, dated May 8, 1885 June 9

Ship Lady Woodhouse—Damage Owners of SS Presto v Owners of SS Lady Woodhouse app of pltt from judgt of the President, dated May 11, 1885 June 10

Ship Tay—Damage Jackson and ors, Owners of the Blanche, v Owners of Ship Tay app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated June 25, 1885 July 3

Ship Main—Damage Owners of cargo ex The Kalaja v Owners of the Main and freight app of dfts from judgt of the President, dated Aug 7, 1885 Aug 19

Ship Annot Lyle—Damage Owners of Monuphar and Cargo v Owners of Annot Lyle app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated July 16, 1885 Sept 18

SPECIAL NOTICE.—Admiralty Appeals, with Assessors, will be taken in Appeal Court I. on Thursday, Jan 14, and following days.

From the Queen's Bench Division, Sitting in Bankruptcy, 1886.

In re
Caldwell
Townsend
Monat
Hastings
Daggatt & Ellison
Barne
Barber

Ex parte
Caldwell
Parsons
Monat
Shackwell & Edwards
Whitehead
Hamilton
The Trustees

N.B.—Bankruptcy Appeals will be taken every Friday in Appeal Court I. until further notice.

Original Motion.
(In Bankruptcy.)

In re Sir R. Mansel Ex parte Stogdon appn to vary minutes of order

From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions in the Queen's Bench Division. 1885.

Gibbs v Tredwell & In re a Solicitor app of Messrs Dod and Longstaffe from Justices Mathew and A L Smith setting aside order of Mr Justice Day as to liability to costs Nov 4

The Queen v Hannam & other Justices of the Cinque Ports, Kent, & Ramsgate Smack Owners Ice Co Ltd (Q B Crown Side) app of the Ramsgate Smack Owners Ice Co Ltd from Justices Manisty and A L Smith directing Magistrates to make order for district rate Dec 3

County Court Appeal J E Fox (Execution Creditor) v J Barnett F R Jacob, Clmt app of Execution Creditor from Justices Mathew & A L Smith as to whether receipts relied on by Claimant are Bills of Sale requiring registration—acts tried in Bromley County Court Dec 4

Trower v Milman app of pltt in person from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Manisty refusing new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Denman in Middx Dec 5

Cameron v Patent Cables Trams Corp., Ltd app of pltt from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Manisty refusing new trial—action tried by the Lord Chief Justice in Middx Dec 10

Johnstone v Milling app of dft from Baron Huddleston & Mr Justice Cave setting aside judgt of County Court with reference as to damages Dec 10

Rhodes v Dawson (Chief Receiver in Bankruptcy or Rush & Co, Clmtes) app of Rush & Co, Clmtes, from order of Justices Mathew & A L Smith directing issue upon terms as to security or claim barred Dec 10

The Spanish Minerals Co v Mordey app of plts from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Manisty refusing order for new trial—action tried by Baron Huddleston in Middx with special jury Dec 12

Hind v The Postmaster General and ors app of pltt in person from Baron Pollock & Mr Justice Manisty affirming order setting aside interlocutory judgment signed in July last Dec 14

Marshall & Co v Musset (sued, &c) app of dfts from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Manisty refusing new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Day with a special jury Dec 14

Dudman v North London Ry Co app of plts from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Manisty refusing new trial—action tried by the Lord Chief Justice in Middx Dec 15

Trower v Shepherd & ors app of pltt in person from Baron Pollock & Mr Justice Manisty refusing new trial—action tried by Dec 15

Wredon v The Gas Light and Coke Co app of pltt from Baron Pollock & Mr Justice Manisty refusing new trial—first trial by Mr Justice Denman—second trial by Mr Justice Grove Dec 16

Steward v The North Metropolitan Trams Co app of dfts from Baron Pollock & Mr Justice Manisty affirming order of Mr Baron Huddleston setting aside order of Master giving leave to amend defence Dec 17

Neale v Clark app of pltt from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Manisty refusing new trial—action tried by Dec 18

King v Rendle app of pltt from Justices Grove & Wills rescinding order for injunction unless money paid into court Dec 19

Neave v Hatherly & anr app of plts from Justices Mathew and A L Smith refusing new trial—action tried by the Lord Chief Justice Dec 21

Martin v Treacher app of pltt from Justices Mathew and A L Smith affirming refusal of Mr Justice Stephen to give liberty to deliver interrogatories under order 21, rules 8 and 25 Dec 23

West Norfolk Farmers' Manure Co Ltd v Archdale and ors app of plts from Justices Mathew & A L Smith refusing new trial—action tried by Baron Huddleston at Norwich Summer Assizes Dec 29

Gregory v Wright & anr app of dfts from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Manisty refusing new trial—action tried by Dec 29

In re George B B Norman, one, &c Ex parte K W Bradwell app of G B B Norman in person from Justices Mathew and A L Smith affirming order of Mr Justice Stephen for taxation Dec 30

Houl v Anderson, Anderson & Co app of dfts from Baron Pollock & Mr Justice Manisty refusing transfer of action to Chancery Division or stay of same with liberty to counter claim Dec 31

1886.

Pecken v Sander, 1877, P 1281 Pecken v Sander, 1877, P 1282 app of pltt from Baron Huddleston & Mr Justice Wills affirming order of Mr Justice Mathew discharging appointment of receiver in above actions Jan 21

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1886.

(Continued from page 171.)

Causes for trial or clearing.

(Set down to January 2nd, inclusive.)

Before Vice-Chancellor BACON.
Causes for trial (with witnesses and without witnesses).

Dade v Davis act
Knight v Van Camp act
Bailward v L & S W Ry Co act
Bayliffe v Traves act
Duffield & East Riding & Co v Waterloo Mills Cake & Co act

Crofts v Nunn act
Kilian v Co-operative Wholesale Soc Ltd act
Newbigging v Adam act
Jackson v Shenton act
Stevens v G N Ry Co act
Rolls v Brown act
In re Webb Webb v Bates act

Victoria Engineering Co ld v Steward act wits
 Leader v Hayes act
 Hill v Legge act
 Rogers v Cropper act wits
 In re Farrow Grange v Cooking act
 O'Sullivan v Young act wits
 Wadham v Lampiere act
 North Central Wagon Co v Manchester Ry Co act wits
 Bromet v Mosey act wits
 In re Whiteley Whiteley v Learoyd act wits
 Kendall v Waterman motn for judgt
 Hobson v Darfield Main Coal Co act wits
 Reynolds & Co Amos & Hunt act wits
 Fensall v Pennington act wits
 Norwich Fire & Socy v Birkbeck act wits
 In re Walcott Walcott v Lyons act wits
 Ridalade v Warwick act wits
 In re Hunter Hunter v Hunter motn for judgt
 Solomon v Dadd act & motn for judgt
 British Tea & Assoc v Cooke and anr act
 Magnus v Imperial Bank ld act
 Williamson v Gooch act
 In re Kiech Harton v Kiech act wits
 Williams v Wright act
 Branser v Sharp act wits
 Kennard v Yorke act wits
 Warner v Hendon Local Board act wits
 Churchill v Liley act wits
 Macintosh v Broder act wits
 Marquis of Londonderry v Russell act wits
 Bullock v Edwards act
 Redaile v Met Ry Co motn for judgt (short)
 In re Williams Williams v Philp act
 Stratton v Joint act wits
 Ritchie v Bunt Estate Trustees of St Giles and St Luke act wits
 Low v Pettey act & motn for judgt wits
 Merchant Venturers of Bristol v Bridges special case & motn for judgt
 Fowler v Bourtton motn for judgt

Further Considerations.

In re Butterwick Butterwick v Butterwick fur con from chbres
 In re Sewall Cunningham v Eason fur con

Adjourned Summonses.

In re Parker Parker v Baxter
 In re Trustees of St Saviour's South-west v Messrs Oylor & V & P Act, 1874
 In re Crossley Crossley v Mynors
 In re Whiteley Whiteley v Learoyd
 Hogge v Boyle
 In re Farnell Farnell v Walton Mackay v Merritt
 In re T E Edwards and Trade Mark, 14288, and Trade Marks Acts, &c
 In re T E Edwards & Trade Marks Acts
 Vaseall v Morgan
 In re Ball Skarratt v Ball
 In re Earl of Aylesford Collins v Finch
 In re Same Same v Same (appln of J O Macchell)
 Earl of Lytton v Devey
 In re Brown Rowell v Richards Mills v Lord Muscaster
 In re London Celluloid Co & Co's Acts
 Watson v Smith
 Boyce v Heather
 In re Keith Smith v Millman
 In re Crooke's Mining & Smelting Co ld & Co's Acts
 In re G H Torrance and Conveyancing &c Act 1861
 In re Vernon Evans & Co & Co's Acts
 Kirby v Star Life Assoc Soc
 In re Earl of Aylesford & Settled Land Act, 1882

Before Mr. Justice KAT.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
 In re Wheeler Wheeler v Wheeler act
 Johnstone v Wallis act
 Reed v Boyd act
 Russell v Charsley act
 Wakefield & Bank v Bannister act
 Tindall v Borsette Hoares Hanbury & Lloyd act

Cayley v Hancock act
 Miles v Blake act
 Capron v Sawyer act
 Floyd v Osborne act
 Tamblin v Tamblin act
 Cooke v Cutts widow act & sums
 Biddingsfield v Allen act & m f j
 Birks v Robinson act & m f j
 McHenry v Bischoffshelm act
 Ross Improvement Commrs v Usborne act
 Venables v Burton act
 Smith, Paterson & Co ld v Abbotsbury Ry Co act
 Thiselton v Foster act
 In re Meynell Meynell v Meynell act
 Perton v Horton act
 Leeds Estates Building, &c Co v Shepherd act
 In re Hoult Godfrey v Mansfield act
 Amos v Herne Bay Pavilion Promenade and Pier Co ld act & m f j
 Peck, Bart v Darry act
 Weston v Reversionary Interest Society act
 Whelan v Warren act
 Corbett v Anderson act
 W Jackson & Co v Napper act
 Lohnstein v Brooking act
 Sheppard v Gilmore act
 In re Greenhill Greenhill v Lovibond act
 Cheltenham Urban Sanitary Authority v Bryant act
 Stokes v Stokes act
 Reynolds v Seeley Seeley v Reynolds act
 Roberts v Webb act
 Grimmer v Chapman Hewetson v Grimmer act
 Briggs v Hard act
 Foulkes v Jeffries act
 Lumley v Haines act
 Paul v Thompson
 In re Gray McMillan v Gray act
 Fennis v Wilks act
 Strickland v Ivens act
 In re Vincent Vincent v Vincent act

Causes for Trial without Witnesses.

Caird v Moss point of law
 In re Jackson Wikeley v Jackson act
 In re Meynell Holmes v Meynell issue of fact
 Harris v Turner act
 Martin v Corser s o pt hd (restored)
 Buckham v Trustees of Town &c of Whitehaven m f j
 In re Dowager Lady Hastings Hallett v Hastings act
 Mitchinson v Candell act
 In re Audin Audin v Audin m f j pt hd
 Hawkesworth v Chaffey act
 Poore v Perry m f j (short)
 In re Naylor Naylor v Dawes act
 Dalgeon v Forster act
 West v West m f j (short)

Further Considerations.

In re Linwood Price v Linwood fur con
 De Senger v Waller fur con
 In re Bradley Chapman v Dixon fur con
 In re Farnell Hunt v Farnell Haigh v Farnell fur con
 In re Burke Dubbin v Bracher fur con
 In re Smith Howe v Moore fur con and two sums
 Jones v Jones fur con
 In re Lowe Jones v Norcop fur con

Adjourned Summonses.

In re The Birkenhead Corps (Ex pte Jones) restored by order
 In re The Lachham Estate (Re Bretherton's Settlement, &c)
 In re Bacon Camp v Coe
 In re The Ramsgate & Margate Tramways Bill
 In re Chapman Fardell v Chapman
 In re Geo Bell Carter v Stadden
 In re Cragg Cragg v Greenwood
 The British Dynamite Co v Krebs
 In re Moore Moore v Roche
 Donisthorpe v Biggs
 Preston Corps v Fullwood Local Board restored
 In re Blundell Blundell v Blundell
 In re Dowell Dowell v Cooper
 British Dynamite Co v Krebs

Bowly v Strong
 Bealey v Scott
 In re the Argyll Coal & Cannell Co ld
 In re Betoourt Hayward v Restcott
 In re Messrs Cookson, Wainwright & Pennington, Solicitors
 In re Firth Harrison v Firth
 Rawlins v Webb
 In re Copley Copley v Thompson
 In re Ashburner Ashburner v Ashburner
 In re Messrs Yorio & Loader to review tax
 Badcock v Tomlinson
 Amos v Herne Bay Pav &c Co dft North
 Same v Same Co plt
 In re Clapham Rutter v Clapham
 In re Copley Copley v Thompson
 In re Wadsworth Rhodes v Sagden
 Campbell v Reversionary Interest Soc ld
 In re Hunt Hunt v Hunt
 In re Osborne Whitehouse v Dewhurst
 Villareal v Unthoff (for payment of £600 &c, &c)
 Same v Same (for payment to trustees, &c)
 In re Mack Matthews v Gamm
 In re Kendall's Trusts & the Furness Ry Co
 In re Ramsey Dixon v Dancan
 In re Hilleary & Taylor
 In re Wilson Pennington v Payne
 Hendry v Turner
 In re Pugh Banting v Pugh
 In re Caloric Engine, &c Co & Co's Acts
 Addison v Ainsworth

Before Mr. Justice CHITTY.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
 Lever & Co v Hazlehurst act (Feb 9 by ord)
 Lister v Norton Bros & Co ld act
 Nemhard v Patman act
 Bliton v Abecasis act (cross-exam on aff)
 Daubney v Horsley, Smith & Co act
 In re Daubney dec Horsley, Smith & Co v Daubney action transferred from V C Bacon
 Adkins v Clements act
 Morgan v Windover act
 Viary v Stroud act
 Terrett v Terrett act
 Le Blond v Curtis act set down by ord
 In re Davison, dec, Wright v Davison act
 In re Bees, dec, Jones v Jeffries act tried by Field, J—re-transferred to Chitty, J—restored by ord May 18
 Earl of Abingdon v Bertie Bertie v Earl of Abingdon claim counter-claim & m f j
 Thorp v Hart act
 Boize v Hemery act
 Buchanan v Hutchings & Crowsley act
 Robinson trading &c v S ranahaa act
 Chandler v Biss act
 Elders v Hunt act
 Duke of Marlborough v Sartoris act (transferred from V C B)
 Loring v Davis & ors for trial against debt T Davis Loring v Davis & ors for trial against debt W Young Loring v Davis & ors for trial against all the debts except Davis & Young to be tried separately by order
 Averie v Averie act
 Wright & Macsfield v Grand Junction Waterworks Co act
 Colonial Bank v Hepworth act (Com to M Y)
 In re Rieidon dec Rieidon v Soammell act
 In re Bugden dec Bell v "Baxter Bugden v Bell act claim & counter-claim
 In re Chisholm dec Jobling v Macdonald act
 March v March act
 Badcock v Kellers act
 Keen v Phillips act
 Wood v Wood act
 Proctor v Sir H W Tyler & ors act
 Homer v Chatterly Lion Co li Chatterly Iron Co v Homer act transferred from V C Bacon by order
 Tyler v Proctor for trial against debt Proctor
 O'Dowd v Rugg act and sums in Re Morris, dec—Harris v O'Dowd

In re E G Morris, dec, Harris v O'Dowd act
 Randall v New Cross Public Hall Co, lmd, New Cross Public Hall Co, lmd, v Randall, Morton v Randall claim and counter-claim
 Oppenheim v Jeune act
 Hainsworth v Woodhouse act
 Dawson v Woodhead act
 Gosset v Davis act
 Ramney School Board, Monmouth v Bassett act
 Denison v Smith act and m f j cross exam on affidavits
 In re Davis, dec, Thompson v Dav is act
 Griggs v Lea act
 Rawson v Minshall act
 London and Provincial Traders', &c, Stores v City Syndicate, lmd act
 Aldridge v Steel and Dodson m f j (set down on issue without pleadings by order)
 West v Burbury act
 Hartopp v Pousonby, Pousonby v Hartopp claim and counter-claim
 Andrews v Utawatt act (S O Feb 1)
 Moore v Deakin (S O till pleadings complete)
 Ashworth v Bickham act
 Same v Whiteley act
 In re Gaunt, dec, Davey v Mercer act
 Earl of Abingdon v Hartopp, Bart act
 Non-witness Causes, Adjourned Summonses, and Special Cases.
 In re Mary Tuckey's Estate, Kinnear v Dunford act sums
 In re Arnold & Slocombe's Contract and V & P Act act sums
 Taylor v Kelly, Ex parte Kelly adj sums
 Taylor v Kelly, Ex parte Caddon adj sums
 In re Croft's Estate, Symonds v Del-pierre act sum
 In re Cameron, dec, Cameron v Well-borne act
 In re Hammersley, dec, Kitchen v Myers act sums
 Matthews v O'Dowd act sums
 In re S Booker's Estate, Booker v Booker act sums
 In re Robert Bell's Estate, Keetley v Ball act sums
 In re Wm Cousin's Trusts (share of Mathew Cousins) act sums
 Heath v Hisey m f j
 Buxton v Blakiston act
 Vernon v Wood act
 In re Arthur Evans's Estate, Evans Randall Claim of Corp'n of Maldon act sums
 Kiteon v Lake act (evidence not complete)
 In re Nathaniel Buckley, dec, Buckley v Watts original sums adj from chambers
 Still v Elliott m f j
 Hewitt v Shaw act
 Eddy v Sir H De Bathe and anr act
 In re Mary Jones, dec, Jeckes v Norman, Ex parte J Jeckes act sums
 In re Duke of Marlborough's Settlement and Settled Land Act act sums
 In re H W Porteus, dec, Scott v Porteus act sums
 In re Progressive Investment Co (Ex parte John Cobbold act sums
 In re Edaile's Estate Edaile v Edaile act sums
 Barnard v Edwards act
 Lane v Janeway m f j
 Hutchinson v Williams act
 In re Bonnor's Estate, Tucker v Good act sums
 Proctor v Tonkins act sums
 In re Samuel Bragke's Estate, Brookes v Rowland act sums
 In re Thomas Brownie's Estate, Browning v Booth act sums
 Gresham Life, &c, Society v Barnett m f j (short)
 Drury-Lowe v Drury-Lowe s p o
 Dickinson v East Riding Club and Rye Course Co, lmd m f j (short)
 De Le Hunt v Twining act
 In re Watson, dec, Liff v Moon act

Further Considerations.

Sharp v Wright f c
 Curving v Weymouth, Curving v Kirby f c

In re W Gooch, dec'd Gooch v Gooch
fe
Beor v Williams fe
Lawton v Lawton fe
In re Clark, dec'd, Clark v Foster fe
Baring v Lord Ashburton fe
In re Barber, dec'd, Burgess v Vinicombe fe

Point of Law.

London, Chatham, and Dover Railway
Co v South-Eastern Railway Co for
argument of question raised by plain-
tiffs' reply pt hd

Before Mr. Justice NORTH.

Transferred from Justices Kay, Chitty,
and Pearson for Trial or Hearing
only, by order dated 13th Nov., 1885.
Pollock v Horne act
Bell Irving v Troutbeck act
Bensade v Shuttleworth act
Hart v Randall act
Doyle v Northumberland Avenue Hotel
Co act
Marchioness of Lothian v Chetwynd,
Talbot and ors
Reynes v St-pleton act
Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Eng-
land v Withers act
Tune v Carnochan act
Popkinson v Peruvian Guano Co act
Bridges v Bowden, Bowden v Bridges,
Hearn v Bowden act
Spencer v Cail, Bartlett & Co act
Nutt v Moulle act
Bager v Brighton Gen Omnibus Co act
Bevan v Lewis mota for judgt
In re Garrard Popleton v Garrard act
Lacy v Winby act

Postponed to end of List.

In re Williams Morgan v Williams act
Ryder v Rowley act
Holmes Marine & Assoc v Allbright
act
In re Brogden Billing v Brogden act
Sheepbridge Coal & Co v Plevins act
In re Watson Carlton v Carlton act
Puley v Woolle act
Waters v Sir W C Hartopp act
Williams v Nanty Glo & Co act

Transferred from Justices Kay, Chitty,
and Pearson, for Trial or Hearing
only, by order dated 22nd Dec., 1885.

Harrison v Lander act
Ambrose v Hammond act
Edison & Light Co v Woodhouse act
Stoher v Tillery Coal Co act
Wharton v Terrell act
Thompson v Bartlett act
Horlock v Drullitt act
Stephen v East Indian Ry Co act
Schofield v Solomon act
Great Western Ry Co v Sounfield act
Barker v Humphreys act
Arnold v Scott act
In re Winn Wian v Aldred act
Synth v Crosse act
Alexander v Tainbridge Wells Imp
Comms act
Paget v Hounsell act
Cooper v Duffield act
Barker v Perry act
Parkinson v Iles act
Roberts v Treborne act
Clark v Browne act
Pitcher v Pitcher act
In re Wetherill Wetherill v Wetherill
act
Broad v Pope act
Pacy v Beal act
Hughes v Twicken act
Baker v Hiscok act
Hayward & Sons v Hayward & Co act
Wright v Waite act
Carmichael v Holdsworth act
Taylor v Lennard act
Saunders v Maisey act
In re Sugg Sugg v Sugg act
Lonsdale v Whiteley act
Todd v Todd act
Tolpitt v Harrison act
Varty v Isle of Wight Trading Co id
act
Ladywell Mining Co v Brookes act
Same Co v Huggons act
Instone v Elmalie act
Footes v Foote act
Robinson v Miles act
Webb v St John's Gas Co act

Nichols v Briggs act
Mount v Withall act
Walker v Cleaver act
Earl St Germans v Thompson act
Welford v Partridge act
Weldhen v Scattergood act
House v Greville act
In re Hardy Goodall v Hardy act
Lamley v Simmons act
Midland Ry Co v Miles act
Barker v Helliwell act
Chamberlain v H-rm act
Mayfair Mansions Co ld v Brit & For
Contracts Corp act
Breathwaite v Moore act
Reese v Goodman act
Mitchell v Reynolds act
Sassoon v Sassoon act
Lewis v Ramsdale act
Damant v Hennell act
In re Jones Jones v Williams act
Jackson v Northampton at Trams Co
act
In re Neville Webster v Neville act
In re Atkinson Poppleton v Atkinson
act
In re Wickham Marony v Taylor act
Litchfield v Jones act & m f j
Monday v Taylor act
Todd v Newsome act

Before Mr. Justice PEARSON.

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).
Clark v Bray act
Byron v Hazlitt act
Briggs & Co v Lardur & Lambert act
Olley v Fisher act
Watson v Walker act
In re Millicamp Goodale v Bullock
act
Crickmer Laroché v Freeman Crickmer
act
Woodward v Green
In re Trevithick Trevithick v Jenkin
act
Dyke v Stephens act
Earl of Harrington v Building Sects
Co ld act
In re T W Cobb Harrison v Cobb act
Cobb v Harrison act
Short v Lon & West Bk ld act
In re Rollason Rollason v Rollason
act
Horne v Sullins act & mtn for judgt
Ruthven v Ruthven act
Wake v Osborn act
Helliwell v Shaw act
Helliwell v Shaw act
Miller v Jones act
Pullinger v Willis act
Hogarth v Macdon act
Inaley v Land Development t Assoc ld
act
Crickmer v Milford Haven Ry & Co ld
act 1885 c 3,210
Same v Same act 1885 c 2,976
Flamstead v Grindell act
Morley v Lythall act
Brown v Clark act

Causes for Trial (without witnesses)
and Adjourned Summonses (Classes
II. and III.)

Aores v Aores act
Wright v Sheffield mtn for judgt
Mendel v Sidebottom adjd summs
In re Cookney Day v Chaplin adjd sms
In re Chatterton Bradley v Booth
adjd summs
In re Roddam Hurrell v Parson adjd
summs enquiries
In re Same Same v Same adjd summs
for declaration
Steven (-xor of W Steven dec'd) v Forbes,
Forbes & Co act
In re Williams Williams v Howell
adjd summs
In re Hewetson Burra v Hewetson
adjd summs
In re Wood Wood v Wood adjd summs
Blake v Tyerman act
T Weldhen v Scattergood mtn for jud
In re Brook Brook v Brook adjd sms
In re Buckley Buckley v Buckley
adjd summs
In re Watkins Morgan v Simpson adjd
summs
In re Chadwick Chadwick v Chadwick
adjd summs
In re Jones Jones v Jones adjd summs
Richardson v Castry act
Mair v Redfern mtn for judgt

In re Trumper Trumper v Trumper
adjd summs
Baddley v Davis act
Linnell v Rawson act
In re Bailie Fitzgerald v Noad adj
summs
In re Duff Mattlebury v Mattlebury
adjd summs
In re Docksey Docksey v Docksey
adjd summs
Cooper v Bromilow act
In re Dickinson's Will, & Co adjd sum
In re Payne Kibble v Payne adjd sum
In re Lloyd Lloyd v Lloyd adjd sum
In re House Invest Soc ld & Co's Acts
adjd sum
In re Bauer Buhl v Bauer adjd sum
Southall v Walker act & m f j
In re Macornie Macornie v Macornie
adjd sum
Holland v Stockwin act
Dawson v North Lonsdale Iron, & Co
act
Butt v Barton act
Murgatroyd v Nicholson act
In re Davies Davies v Jones adjd sum
In re Oldfield Oldfield v Oldfield adjd
sum
Priesley v Hodgson act
In re Fisher Currie v Kennedy
Nibbs v Simons act
Harris v Colefax m f j short
Patent Wax-d & Oiled Paper Co v
Mason m f j short
Ripley v Sawyer m f j short
Brace v Cannock Brewery Co ld act &
m f j

Further Considerations.

In re Mills Mills v Miller fur con
In re Price Price v Mathias fur con
restored
Orange v Martyn fur con
In re Goldings Golding v Hills fur
con
In re Golding Golding v Hills fur con
In re Potter Mo Winn v Wilson
Mander v Lawrence fur con
In re Anderson Broughton v Ander-
son fur con
In re Allan Havelock v Havelock-
Allan fur con
In re Foster Foster v Foster fur con

In re Soane Roby v Thomas fur con
Walker v Slater fur con
In re Bledon Bledon v Bledon fur con
In re W Price In re H Price Price v
Price fur con
In re Wilson Swinney v Wilson fur
con
Murray v Crichton Taylor v Roxby
fur con
Boyd v Allen fur con
Kennard v Kennard fur con

Adjourned Summonses (Class IV.).

Boswell v Cook (ex parte Pits)
Same v Same (ex parte deft C J Ban-
yon)
Same v Same (not before Nov 1)
In re Jacobson, Cox v Jacobson
In re Chadwick
In re Jordan, Kind v Ploard
In re Same, Same v Same
Batten v Wedgwood Coal and Iron Co,
ld
In re Boyne, Crofton v Crofton
In re Thomas, Lofy v Wyman
In re Evans, Collier v Cummins
In re J Davis's Charity and London,
Tilbury, and Southend Ry Co, & Co
In re Yielding and Westbrook and V &
P Act, 1874
In re Watson, Carlton v Carlton
In re Same, Same v Same for inquiries
as to heir at law
Boyd v Allen
In re Hartley, Stedman v Dunster (No
2,823)
In re Same, Same v Same (No 2,823)
In re Same, Same v Same (No 2,826)
In re The Bedford Charity, In re act
Street Improvements Act, 1872, and
L C Act, 1845
In re Lyon, Edwards v Lloyd
Beshell v Gen Stock Exchange, lmd,
and ors
In re G Western Forest of Dean Coal Co,
lmd
In re Hargreaves and Thompson and
V and P Act
In re W J Miles, Miles v Miles, In re
J Miles, Miles v Miles fur hearing
of two adjd sums after Official Re-
feree's report

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1886.

New Trial Paper.

For Judgment.

Hodgson v London & N W Ry Co (heard before Baron Pollock and Mr Justice
Hawkins)
Grief v Ellis & anr (Laby 3rd party)
Laby v Grief mtn to set aside Official Referee's report (heard before Mr Justice
Mathew and Mr Justice A L Smith)

For Argument.

Set down 2nd April 1885 Middlesex, Shickle & ors v Lawrence & anr Mr B
Rowlands for dt C E Lawrence Justice Stephen
Set down 2nd April 1885 Middlesex Compagnie Financiere et Commerciale du
Pacifique v Peruvian Guano Co ld Mr C Russell Baron Huddleston
Set down 2nd April 1885 Middlesex Shickle & ors v Lawrence & anr Sir H
Giffard for dt C N Hoare Justice Stephen
Set down 16th June 1885 Middlesex Smith v Reed & ors Mr L Smith Baron
Huddleston
Set down 29th June 1885 Middlesex De Worms v Hughes Mr Jelf Baron
Pollock
Set down 8th July 1885 Middlesex Saunders v Pawley Mr E Clarke Justice
Day
Set down 24th July 1885 Middlesex Everitt & anr v Williams Mr R T Reid
Justice Wills
Set down 24th July 1885 Monmouth Spittle v G W Ry Co Mr David
Justice Cave
Set down 25th July 1885 Middlesex Jewson an infant v Gatti & anr sued and
trading & Mr Robson Justice Day
Set down 31st July 1885 Middlesex Blackburn Low & Co v Haslam Mr
Hollans Justice Day
Set down 1st August 1885 Goole In the Matter of an Election Petition from
Goole Marsland & ors petms v Hickman & anr repts Mr C Dodd M Griffiths
Esq Commr
Set down 7th August 1885 Middlesex Ocean Steamship Co v Anderson Tritton
& Co Mr H Matthews Justice Day
Set down 13th August 1885 Swansea Brown v G W Ry Co Mr McIntyre
Justice Denman
Set down 17th August 1885 Swansea Hamer v Cambrian Ry Co Mr
Sweetnam Justice Stephen
Set down 21st August 1885 Liverpool Maddock v The Wallasey Local Board
Mr C Russell Justice Lopes
Set down 27th August 1885 Chelmsford Fox & ors v Ry Passengers Assoc Co
Mr Grantham Baron Huddleston
Set down 9th October 1885 Birmingham Dugdale & ors v Gillett Mr Jelf
Justice A L Smith

Set down 26th October 1885 Swansea Marsh & ors v Bailey & anr Attorney-
Gen Justice Denman
Set down 26th October 1885 York Goodball v Wilson Mr Edge Justice
Wills
Set down 28th October 1885 Swansea Tillet & Co v Jones & Co and The Cwm
Avon Works Proprietors Mr B F Williams Justice Stephen Motion for
judgment to be argued with this motion
Set down 28th October 1885 Salisbury Brine v Butt & anr Mr Kinglake
Justice Field
Set down 29th October 1885 Birmingham Griffin v Carlyle Mr Jeff Justice
Day
Set down 30th October 1885 Worcester Smith v Jaffray Mr H Matthews
Justice A L Smith
Set down 30th October 1885 Swansea Holman & ors v Dasiere Mr B Row-
lands Justice Denman
Set down 6th November 1885 Middlesex Devey v Drummond Mr Channell
Meadows White, Esq, QC, Special Referee Motion for judgment to be argued
with this motion
Set down 24th November 1885 Middlesex Powell v Graves & Co Mr McIntyre
Justice Grove
Set down 25th November 1885 Middlesex Rice v Howard & anr, trading &c
Mr G Bruce for deft J Lees L C J of England
Set down 26th November 1885 Middlesex Trower v Stephenson & ors Pltff in
person Justice Day
Set down 26th November 1885 Liverpool Westfalsche Union Iron and Wire
Co ld v Samuel Sons & Benjamin Mr H Collins Justice Mathew
Set down 30th November 1885 Middlesex Weldon v De Baehs Pltff in person
L C J of England
Set down 1st December 1885 Liverpool Stephens v Lowndes Mr B Rowlands
Justice Mathew
Set down 2nd December 1885 Middlesex Roberts v Gregory Mr Greenfield
Justice Day
Set down 2nd December 1885 Middlesex Staveley v London Road Car Co ld
Mr McIntyre Justice Grove
Set down 4th December 1885 Middlesex Trower v Law Life Assoc Co Pltff
in Person Justice Grove
Set down 4th December 1885 Middlesex Trower v Budd and anr Pltff in
Person Justice Grove
Set down 6th December 1885 Middlesex Gattie v Piggott Pltff in Person
Justice Grove
Set down 6th December 1885 Middlesex Lumley v Nicholson Mr Channell
L C J of England
Set down 7th December 1885 Middlesex Millar v Toulmin Mr Murphy
L C J of England
Set down 7th December 1885 Middlesex Groves, McLean and Co on behalf &c
v Grant & Co Mr Bigham Justice Grove
Set down 9th December 1885 Middlesex Hailes v Fricker Mr Paget Justice
Lopes
Set down 9th December 1885 Middlesex Kager, by next friend v Squires Mr
Kisch Justice Lopes
Set down 10th December 1885 Middlesex Haines & Co v Firminger & Co Mr
Wills Justice Grove
Set down 10th December 1885 Middlesex Webster & anr v Friedberg Mr
Grantham Justice Grove Motion for judgment to be argued with this motion
Set down 15th December 1885 Middlesex Davies & Wife v Webb Mr Addison
Justice Day
Set down 18th December 1885 Middlesex Brault v Brasch & anr Mr Witt
Justice Grove
Set down 19th December 1885 Middlesex Harris & anr v The Westminster
Fire Office Mr Gairy L C J of England
Set down 19th December 1885 Middlesex Harris & anr v The Westminster
Fire Office Mr Gairy L C J of England
Set down 1st January 1886 Middlesex Ward & anr v Conover Mr Kemp
Justice Day
Set down 1st January 1886 Middlesex Mills v Mayor &c of London Mr Crisp
Justice Grove

SPECIAL PAPER.

Set down 9th December 1885 Due 15th December 1885 Clarke, R & Co Tod v
New Zealand Agricultural Co ld Special case before two Judges
Set down 28th December 1885 Due 15th January 1886 Bell, B & G Hearse v
North-Eastern Ry Co Special case before two Judges
Set down 5th January 1886 Due 15th January 1886 Whitfield Cooper v
Blackmore and ors Points of law

OPPOSED MOTIONS.

For Judgment.

GINNETT v WHITTINGHAM heard before the Lord Chief Justice of England and
Mr Justice Mathew

For Argument.

Tillet & Co v Jones & Co and ors motion for judgt to be argued with motion for
New Trial No 20
Devey v Drummond motion for judgt to be argued with motion for New Trial
No 25
Webster & anr v Friedberg motion for judgt to be argued with motion for New
Trial No 43
In re Arbitration between E Owen & anr
Bond v Churcher
Smith v The Trustees for the District and Harbour of Maryport
In re Storer & anr. Solicitors Storer & Co v Cookson and Wife
Whitall v Barlow & anr
Morgan v Vaughan & anr
Same v Same
Hatch v Pepper
Beale v MacGregor, Bart
Tucker or Cason v Collinson & ors
In re two Solicitors (as to one Solicitor) Ex parte Minton
In re an Arbitration between Philip Martin and Charles Pitt (stands over)
The Eglington Chemical Co ld v Mason Bros
Webb & Sons v Ide & Co
Russell & Co ld v Brown & Co
Critchley v Brownbill
In re E T Leigh, Gent &c Ex pte T E Jones

CROWN PAPER.

For Judgment.

Leicestershire Loughborough Highway Board v Curzon Magistrate's case
For Argument.

London Brightmore v May & ors Mayor's Court Nisi to enter judgt for defts
or new trial Sir T Chambers, Judge 4 O till further order stay in meantime
Hertfordshire The Queen v Cheshunt Local Bd Mandamus Defendant's motion
for stay S O till 29th January
Wells The Queen v Livett and anr Jj, &c. & Wells Urban Sanitary Authority
Nisi to state case Ex pte Wells Water Co (pt hd June 23rd Justices Field
& Manisty)
Same Wells Water Cold v Wells Urban Sanitary Authority Mag case (same)
Gloucestershire Bristol Wall v The Mayor &c of Bristol and ors County Ct
Nisi to enter judgt for defts H H Judge Metcalfe
Leeds, Yorkshire The Queen v Registrar of County Court of Yorkshire holden
at Leeds and W Copping Nisi to summon jury in action "Copping v Copping"
Ex pte C Copping Adjourned Nov 4th 1885
Lincolnshire Bourne Hemstock and ors v Hunt and ors County Court Special
case defendants' appeal H H Judge Hughes (pt hd Nov 10, 1885—S O till
Justices Day and Smith sit together)
Croydon Johnson v Mayor &c of Croydon Magistrate's case
Norfolk The Queen v Nar Valley Drainage Board Nisi for mandamus to take
upward Expte Harding
Glamorganshire Tonness Union v Cardiff Union Quarter Sessions Special
case 12 & 13 Vict c 45
Essex, Rochford and Southend Foster v Cotgrove County Court Plaintiff's
nisi for new trial H H Judge Abdy S O till further notice after Superior
Court action disposed of
Warwickshire, Birmingham The Official Receiver as Trustees of the property of
H G Izon, a bankrupt v Tailby County Court Nisi to enter judgt for
defendants H H Judge Chalmers
Middlesex Grand Junction Waterworks Co v Peal Magistrate's case
Devonshire The Queen v Belfield Indictment Nisi for new trial Justices Field
S O till after next Assizes
Rochdale Rochdale Flying Horse Benefit Building Soc v Mayor &c of Rochdale
Magistrate's case
Same Rochdale Permanent Benefit Building Soc v Same Magistrate's case
Surrey The Queen v Joint Committee L & S W & Met Dist Ry Cos Nisi for
mandamus to summon jury to assess compensation Expte Saumer
Hertfordshire The Queen v Lord and Steward of Manor of Great Hornstead
Nisi for mandamus to accept surrender Expte Wild & ors (pt hd Dec 1, 1885)
S O till 1st Crown Paper, Hilary Sittings
Staffordshire Chisholm v Holland Magistrate's case
Glamorganshire The Queen v J Bishop Esq and ors, Licensing Jj &c for the
Division of Miskin Higher Nisi for mandamus to hear &c apply for Licence
Expte Jones
Derbyshire, Belper Potts v Great Northern Ry Co County Court Special case
Defts' appeals H H Judge Woodforde
Staffordshire Horner v Cadman Magistrate's case
Middlesex, Bloomsbury Mason & anr v Simmons County Court Nisi to enter
judgment for defts or new trial H H Judge Bacon
Middlesex Wortley v Vestry of St Mary, Islington Magistrate's case
Middlesex, Clerkenwell Newman, trading &c v Coop County Court Nisi to
reverse or vary judgment or new trial H H Judge Eddis
Northumberland The Queen v Tyne Boiler Works Cold Order of Sessions
Sussex The Queen v Mayor &c of Lewes Indictment Nisi for fine and writ
of abatement
London The Queen v Lord Mayor of London & anr Nisi to hear summons Ex
pte Emma Vance
Yorkshire, Pontefract Rhodes v Bainton (Lake and anr claimants) County
Court Nisi to enter judgment for pliff or new trial
London The Queen v Lord Mayor &c of London and ors Nisi for prohibition
Andover The Queen v Clark & ors Jj &c for Andover Order of Sessions Nisi
to quash
London Pollitzer, trading &c and ors v Steamship Casapedia ld Mayor's Court
Nisi to enter judgment for defts or new trial
Surrey, Croydon Colget v Norrish County Court Nisi to enter judgment for
defts
London Goldstrow, trading &c v Tallerman, sued &c (Harris claimant) City of
London Court Special case Pltff's appeal E Bealey, Esq, Deputy Judge
Cheshire Rookes v Guardians of the Poor of the Wirral Union Magistrate's
case
Ruthin Jones & anr v Jones Magistrate's case
Northumberland, Newcastle Dickson v Great Northern Ry Co County Court
Special case Defts appeal H H Judge Holl
Middlesex The Queen v Tottenham Local Board of Health Nisi for superadees
to certiorari Ex pte Corble & ors
Cheshire Williams v Wallasey Local Board Magistrate's case
London Bryant & anr v Breslau & Co City Court Nisi to enter judgt for
Pltffs for £13 16s 3d or for new trial Mr Commissioner Kere
Yorkshire, Sheffield Jacobs v Harbach County Court Pltff's nisi for new
trial H H Judge Ellison
Met Pol Dist Davey v Thompson Magistrate's case
Norfolk, Norwich Tuck (on behalf of him self &c) v Goward County Court
Special case (Equity) Defts' appeal H H Judge Price
West Hartlepool West Hartlepool Improvement Commissioners v Levy Magis-
trate's case
Nottinghamshire, Nottingham Cropper v Symberry (Symberry & anr claimants)
County Court Nisi to enter judgt for pltff (the Execution Creditor) or for new
trial H H Judge Bristowe
Yorkshire, W R Kirkstall Local Board v L & N W Ry Co Magistrate's case
Newcastle upon Tyne Strike v Collins Magistrate's case
Middlesex, Brentwood Weblin, widow, v Ballard County Court Nisi to enter
judgt for defts or new trial H H Judge Sioner
Cheshire, Birkenhead Overtail v Moore County Court Special case Pltff's
appeal H H Judge Foulkes
Staffordshire The Queen v Judge of County Court of Stafford holden at Walsall
and Wilkinsons Nisi to add defts Expte Goodwin
Kent Guardians of Plymton St Mary v Guardians of Tunbridge Appellant's
nisi to quash order of sessions with case
Surrey The Queen v Joint Committee of L & S W & Met Dist Ry Cos Nisi

for mandamus to issue warrant &c Expte Trustees of M Wells, dec
Nottinghamshire The Queen v G H Fillingham Esq and ors, Jj &c and Patching
and anr Nisi to hear application for fresh summons Expte Coleman
Lancashire The Queen v A Castellain & ors Jj &c and Guardians of Poor of
Torteth Park Nisi to state case Expte to L Sewell

REVENUE PAPER.

For Argument.

Attorney-General v Newcomen & ors exception to answer
Cases as to Income Tax and Inhabited House Duty.
Mayor, Commonality and Citizens of London, Applts and Blake (Surveyor of
Taxes) Respt Blake (Surveyor of Taxes) Applt and the Mayor, Commonality
and Citizens of London, Respts
St Andrew's Hospital, Northampton, Applts, and Shearsmith (Surveyor of Taxes)
Respt
The Truro Public Rooms Co Applts and Armfield (Surveyor of Taxes) Respt
Purchas (Surveyor of Taxes) Applt and Fisher & Co Respts
Partridge & anr Applts and Mallandaine (Surveyor of Taxes) Respt

ROTA OF QUEEN'S BENCH MASTERS.

The following is the rota of masters of the Queen's Bench Division who
will attend at chambers during the Hilary Sittings, viz.:—A to F.—
Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, Master Romilly; Tuesdays, Thurs-
days and Saturdays, Master Johnson. G to N.—Mondays, Wednesdays,
and Fridays, Master Kaye; Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, Master
Butler. O to Z.—Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, Master Walton;
Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, Master Francis.

THE WINTER ASSIZES.

Days and Places appointed for holding the Winter Assizes, 1886.

NORTHERN CIRCUIT.

Mr. Justice DAY. Mr. Justice GRANTHAM.

Monday, January 11, at Appleby; Thursday, January 14, at Carlisle;
Thursday, January 21, at Lancaster; Monday, January 25, at Manchester;
Saturday, February 6, at Liverpool.

NORTH-EASTERN CIRCUIT.

Mr. Justice CAVE. Mr. Justice SMITH.

Tuesday, January 12, at the Moot Hall, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Tues-
day, January 12, at the Guildhall, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Wednesday,
January 20, at the Courts, Durham; Tuesday, January 26, at the Guild-
hall, York; Tuesday, January 26, at the Castle, York; Friday, January 29,
at the Town Hall, Leeds.

WESTERN CIRCUIT.

Mr. Justice GROVE. Mr. Justice STEPHEN.

Tuesday, January 12, at Devizes; Friday, January 15, at Dorchester;
Wednesday, January 20, at Taunton; Tuesday, January 26, at Bodmin;
Saturday, January 30, at the Castle of Exeter; Saturday, January 30, at
the Guildhall, Exeter; Friday, February 5, at the Guildhall, Bristol;
Saturday, February 13, at the Castle of Winchester.

SOUTH-EASTERN CIRCUIT.

Mr. Justice HAWKINS. Mr. Justice STEPHEN.

Monday, January 11, at Maidstone; Monday, February 1, at Chelms-
ford; Thursday, February 4, at Hertford; Monday, February 8, at Lewes;
Tuesday, January 12, at Huntingdon; Thursday, January 14, at the Shire-
hall, Chesterton; Tuesday, January 19, at the Castle of Norwich; Tues-
day, January 19, at the Guildhall, Norwich; Tuesday, January 26, at
Ipswich; County of Surrey, Friday, January 22, at Croydon.

OXFORD CIRCUIT.

Mr. Baron HUDDLESTON. Mr. Justice WILLS.

Monday, January 11, at Reading; Thursday, January 14, at Oxford;
Saturday, January 16, at Worcester; Saturday, January 16, at the City
of Worcester; Saturday, January 23, at Gloucester; Saturday, January 23,
at the City of Gloucester; Saturday, January 30, at Monmouth; Thurs-
day, February 4, at Hereford; Saturday, February 6, at Shrewsbury;
Saturday, February 13, at Stafford.

MIDLAND CIRCUIT.

Mr. Justice MANISTY.

Monday, January 11, at Aylesbury; Thursday, January 14, at Bedford;
Monday, January 18, at Northampton; Thursday, January 21, at the
Castle of Leicester; Thursday, January 21, at the Borough of Leicester;
Wednesday, January 27, at Oakham; Thursday, January 28, at the Castle
of Lincoln; Thursday, January 28, at the City of Lincoln; Wednesday,
February 3, at Nottingham; Wednesday, February 3, at the Town of
Nottingham; Thursday, February 11, at Derby.

Mr. Justice MATHEW. Mr. Justice WILLS.

Wednesday, February 17, at Warwick; Monday, February 22, at
Birmingham.

NORTH WALES AND CHESTER CIRCUIT.

LORD CHIEF JUSTICE. Mr. Baron POLLOCK.

Monday, January 11, at Welshpool; Thursday, January 14, at Dolgelly;
Saturday, January 16, at Carnarvon; Wednesday, January 20, at Beau-
maris; Saturday, January 23, at Ruthin; Thursday, January 26, at Mold;
Thursday, January 28, at Chester Castle.

SOUTH WALES CIRCUIT.

LORD CHIEF JUSTICE. Mr. Baron POLLOCK.

Thursday, January 14, at Haverfordwest; Thursday, January 14, at the
Town of Haverfordwest; Monday, January 18, at Cardigan; Wednesday,
January 20, at Carmarthen; Wednesday, January 20, at the Borough of
Carmarthen; Saturday, January 23, at Brecon; Tuesday, January 26, at
Presteign; Thursday, February 4, at Cardiff.

LEGAL NEWS.

As M. Dumont, a solicitor, was leaving the Palais de Justice at Paris
last week, an elderly lady named Peyron fired three shots at him with a
revolver. M. Dumont escaped untouched, and the lady was at once
arrested. She charges the solicitor with ruining her through mismanage-
ment of a lawsuit.

Sir Richard Webster, Q.C., M.P., was entertained at dinner on
Saturday evening at the Albion Hotel by the members of the South-
Eastern Circuit, in celebration of his appointment as Attorney-General.
The chair was occupied by Mr. Bulwer, Q.C., and among those present
were Lord Bramwell, Mr. Baron Pollock, Mr. Justice Denman, Mr.
Justice Mathew, Mr. Justice A. L. Smith, and Mr. Justice Grantham.

At a sitting for the taxation of the returning officer's charges for
Greenwich and Woolwich, Mr. Charles Pitt-Taylor, the taxing officer,
questioned a charge of £11 11s. for the preparation and publication of
notices, directions to voters, which were posted up at the stations. He
considered that this should be included in the allowance of £18 for
the publication of election notices. Mr. Smith (returning officer) said
that the whole of that amount was absorbed in the publication of notices
of election agents' appointments, &c. The taxing officer said no doubt it
was a very hard case, but he could not include such a charge under the
head of "constructing and fitting up of the polling-stations." He must
disallow the amount. Mr. Smith said it was especially hard, because he
should have to pay it out of his own pocket, although he had only done
what the law required. Mr. Smith further mentioned that the scale
under the Act made no provision whatever for the returning officer's ser-
vices. The taxing officer said that appeared to be so, and no doubt there
would have to be an alteration in the law. The total of the charges was
reduced from £291 to £277.

At the Manchester Assizes on Tuesday, in a case of Herbert Masters,
who was tried on a charge of assaulting a girl over sixteen, counsel for the
defence having commented on the fact that the prisoner in this case could
not give evidence, Mr. Justice Stephen said:—"For years it has been
my opinion—and I shall continue to act upon it—that prisoners, though
defended by counsel, have a right to make statements. I always, there-
fore, allow a prisoner to say what he pleases on his own behalf, provided
he make such statement before his counsel speaks, which prevents its
being a mere corroboration of counsel's suggestions. I think the law of
the land justifies this course, though the authorities on which I adopt it
might not, perhaps, be satisfactory to other minds than mine. If a
suitable occasion occurs I will give my reasons at length. But the practice
is not uniform, there being no superior authority to make it so, and the
matter is at present in an unsatisfactory condition. The late Act, which has
apparently worked well hitherto, allows prisoners in certain cases to give
evidence on oath, but it has left the law in so fragmentary a condition
that I hope Parliament will deal with the question before long. The
prisoner in this case, therefore, may make a statement if he wishes. If he
does not, it should not prejudice him before the jury, as he has not had
notice that he might do so." Counsel for the prosecution submitted that
the prisoner was competent to give evidence. The learned judge,
however, thought that the 20th section of the Criminal Law Amendment
Act did not apply to this case.

COMPANIES.

WINDING-UP NOTICES.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

METROPOLITAN GUARANTEE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.—
Petition for winding up, presented Dec 21, directed to be heard before Chitty,
J., on Jan 16. Indermaur and Brown, Chancery lane, agents for Walker,
Bolton le Moors, solicitor for the petitioner

[Gazette, Jan. 8.]

ALLIANCE COLLIERY COMPANY, LIMITED.—Chitty, J., has fixed Thursday, Jan 21
at 11, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator

AUTOMATIC MUSICAL INSTRUMENT COMPANY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on
or before Jan 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their
debts or claims, to Francis Henry Elsworth, 43, Moorgate st. Monday, Feb 15
at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

JOHN VERNON HOPE AND COMPANY, LIMITED.—Bacon, V.C., has, by an order
dated June 30, appointed William Brock Keen, 18, King st, Chancery, to be
official liquidator

LARMUTH AND COMPANY, LIMITED.—Pearson, J., has, by an order dated Dec 19,
appointed George Shead, 9, Laurence Pountney hill, to be official liquidator

PONTNEWYD STEEL AND TIN PLATE COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by
Chitty, J., dated Dec 18, it was ordered that the company be wound up.
Bridges and Co, Red Lion sq, agents for Hodgson, Abergavenny, solicitor for
the petitioner

QUEENBOROUGH CEMENT COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented
Jan 9, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on Saturday, Jan 23. Warner,
Quality ct, Chancery lane, solicitor for the petitioner

REVOLVING BALL FILTER COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented
Jan 8, directed to be heard before Pearson, J., on Jan 23. Beck, East India
avenue, Leadenhall st, solicitor, petitioner in person

WEST KENSINGTON ESTATES COMPANY, LIMITED.—Kay, J., has, by an order dated
Dec 23, appointed Frederick Whinney, 8, Old Jewry, to be official liquidator

[Gazette, Jan. 12.]

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BELFAST CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.—Chitty, J., has, by an order dated Dec 4,
appointed Charles Fitch Kemp, 8, Walbrook, to be official liquidator. Creditors
are required, on or before Feb 9, to send their names and addresses, and the
particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Tuesday, Feb 23, is appointed
for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

[Gazette, Jan. 12.]

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

PLAS SILVER LEAD MINING COMPANY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 12 to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Alfred Herbert Powall, 69, Princess st, Manchester. Friday, Jan 19 at 11.30, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

[Gazette, Jan. 12.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

NORTH LONDON TERTOTAL CAB DRIVERS' BENEFIT SOCIETY, 54, High st, Islington. Jan 7

PERSEVERANCE DIVISION ORDER OF THE SONS OF TEMPERANCE, Temperance Hall, Tipton st, Salford, Lancaster. Jan 8

PITMINSTER FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Lamb Inn, Blagdon, Pitminster, Somerset. Jan 6

[Gazette, Jan. 12.]

CREDITORS' CLAIMS.

CREDITORS UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP 36.
LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

FORRESTER, JAMES, Ashmore, Sydenham hill, Kent, Merchant. Feb 24. Tamplin and Co, Fenchurch st

GREENHALGH, JOHN, Tottington Lower End, Lancaster. March 1. Crossland, Bury

HILLIUT, RUBEN SAMUEL, Fenchurch st, Merchant. Feb 24. Tamplin and Co, Fenchurch st

HEPWORTH, WILLIAM, Huddersfield, Coal Merchant. March 31. Bottomley, Huddersfield

HUNTER, SARAH, Ashton upon Mersey, Chester. Feb 23. Clay and Son, Manchester

JONES, JANE, Bangor, Canatvon. Jan 8. Roberts, Bangor

KINSLEY, CHRISTIANA, Kingston upon Hull. Jan 30. Thompson and Co, Hull

KINSLEY, JOHN, Leeds, Secretary to the Farnley Iron Company. Jan 30. Thompson and Co, Hull

LEVETT, JAPHET, Brighton, Carpenter. Feb 20. Woods and Dempster, Brighton

PARKIN, EBENEZER, Sheffield, Tailor. Feb 16. Bramley, Sheffield

PHILLIPS, SAMUEL, Manchester, Restaurant Proprietor. March 1. Heywood and Son, Manchester

SANDYS, JAMES, Leamington Priors. Feb 27. Field and Sons, Leamington

SHIELD, CHARLOTTE, Scarborough, Yorks. Jan 31. Watts and Kitching, Scarborough

TORKINGTON, JOSEPH, Manchester, Baker. Jan 30. Croften and Craven, Manchester

[Gazette, Dec. 29.]

BENNETT, CHARLES, Brentry, Henbury, Gloucester. Jan. 15. Meade-King and Biggs, Bristol

BOOTT, WILLIAM, Kingston-upon-Hull, Gent. Feb 1. Holden and Co, Hull

GOODING, THOMAS HENRY, Woolston, Hants, Civil Engineer. Feb 8. Willcocks, Gt George st, Westminster

HALL, HENRY, Willenhall, Stafford, Upholsterer. Jan 15. Underhill and Lawrence, Wolverhampton

HOLYOAKE, THOMAS, Llangollen, Denbigh, Esq. Jan 15. Underhill and Lawrence, Wolverhampton

JAMES, WILLIAM BOYCE, Heathfield, Weybridge, Surrey, Esq. Feb 27. Vickers and Co, Sheffield

JAMIESON, GEORGE, Princes-gardens, South Kensington, Esq. Feb 15. Farrer and Co, Lincoln's inn fields

KERFOOT, JAMES, Southport, Lancaster. Feb 6. Stephenson, Liverpool

LATHAM, JEMIMA FERRIER, Southsea. Feb 1. Davidson and Morris, Queen Victoria st

LEVY, HYAM MOSES, Torrington sq, Dealer. Feb 1. Eastwood, Great Saint Helen's

MCKEE, MARGARET, Woodmansterne Rectory, Epsom, Surrey. Mar 1. Bircham and Co, Parliament st, Westminster

REAVE, MARIA, Mattishall, Norfolk. Mar 7. Keith and Co, Norwich

SAMPSON, HENRY, Sheffield, Gent. Feb 1. Webster and Styling, Sheffield

SAUNDERS, JOHN, Over Wallop, Hants, Gent. Feb 12. Footner and Son, Andover

SHIRES, RICHARD, Tyntesfield, Ashton-upon-Mersey, Chester, Gent. Mar 1. Taylor and Taylor, Manchester

STREE, ANNA LYCETTE BLAIR, Albert Gate, Hyde Park. Jan 31. Wordsworth and Co, Threadneedle st

TURNER, WALTER JAMES, Bradford, York, Patent Agent. Jan 30. Atkinson and Wilson, Bradford

WILLIAMS, MARGERY, Wallacey, Chester. Feb 1. Wright and Co, Water st

WINCH, THOMAS, Hastingwood, Essex, Builder. Feb 28. Windus and Trotter, Epping

[Gazette, Jan. 1.]

BACLEY, ANDREW WHYTE, Stevenage, Herts. Feb. 15. Freer and Co, Leicester

BARFIELD, HENRY WOLSEY, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Admiral. Feb. 16. Gattard and Co, Suffolk st, Pall Mall East

BURTON, CHARLOTTE HEATHCOTE MONTAGUE, Beaumont st, Marylebone. Feb 16. Collyer-Bristow and Co, Bedford row

COCKBURN, CATHERINE ELIZABETH SMARK, Lillie rd, Fulham. Mar 31. Every, Hoxton

DITCHETT, WILLIAM EDWIN, Louth, Lincoln, Surgeon. Mar 31. Wood, Louth

DREW, HARRIETT, Bristol. Jan 20. Perham, Bristol

DUNNING, CHARLES, Fulham rd, South Kensington, Builder. Mar 4. Thompson and Groom, Raymond bldgs, Gray's inn

FARGUE, MARGARET LA, Providence, Rhode Island, U.S.A. Feb 15. Freer and Co, Leicester

GOODALL, JONATHAN CHARLES, Camden rd, Esq. Feb 17. Pencoek, South sq, Gray's inn

HARTLEY, REV JAMES, Burton-on-Trent, Clerk. Jan 28. Taylor, Burton-on-Trent

HAYES, CHARLES, Norwich, Ironmonger. Feb 11. Havers, Norwich

HINDE, ELEANOR, Whitehaven, Cumberland. Feb 12. Mason and Thompson, Whitehaven

HOSFORD, WILLIAM, Millbrook, nr Southampton. Feb. 16. Benson, Clement's inn, Strand

JERDAN, CAROLINE, Lincoln's inn fields. Feb 15. Beyfus and Beyfus, Lincoln's inn fields

LOUGHBOROUGH, THOMAS, Tulse Hill, Surrey, Esq. Mar 1. Loughborough and Co, Austin friars

LYNE, ANN, Park st, Islington. Mar 4. Groom, Raymond bldgs, Gray's inn

MEAD, JOHN, Aylesbury, Buckingham, Coachbuilder. Feb. 13. Fell, Aylesbury

OLDFIELD, ELIZA HARRIET, Hornsey rd. Feb 15. Brown, Lincoln's inn fields

WALKER, JOHN, Upper Thames st, Iron Merchant. Mar 1. Ashbridge, White-chapel rd

WILLIAMS, MARY ANN, Gloucester. Feb 1. Smith, Gloucester

WOODS, WILLIAM HENRY, Upper Addiscombe rd, Croydon, Underwriter. Feb 17. Rumney, Basinghall st

YOUNG, ADOLPHUS WILLIAM, Hare Hatch House, Berks, Esq. J.P. Feb 18. Young and Co, Mildred's ct, Poultry

[Gazette, Jan. 5.]

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

MARRIAGE.

OATS-PEARCE, Jan. 12 at St. Saviour's, Brixton, John Lumsden Oatts, solicitor, Glasgow, to Ellen Margaret, daughter of the late Robert Pearce, of Acre Wharf, Lambeth.

DEATH.

HANSON, Jan. 6, at 1, Upper Westbourne-terrace, W., Alfred Hanson, barrister-at-law, aged 69.

FEE, TWO GUINEAS, for a sanitary inspection and report on a London dwelling-house. Country surveys by arrangement. The Sanitary Engineering Company, 115, Victoria-street, Westminster.-(ADVT.)

LONDON GAZETTES.

THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883.

FRIDAY, Jan. 8, 1886.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

Atkinson, John, Dewsbury, Yorks, Fish Dealer. Dewsbury. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 4. Exam Feb 2

Bland, John Nichol, Liverpool, Clothier. Liverpool. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 18 at 12 at Court-house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool

Box, Edwin, jun, Dewsbury, Herring Curer. Dewsbury. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 2

Brightman, Thomas, Little Staughton, Bedfordshire, Farmer. Bedford. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 6. Exam Jan 25

Brown, Henry, Buxton, Derbyshire, Bookseller. Stockport. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 4. Exam Jan 21 at 11.30

Brown, James Bryce, Cannon st, Iron Merchant. High Court. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 10 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields

Charles, Thomas, Roads, nr Llanelly, Carmarthenshire, Butcher. Carmarthen. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 12

Clarke, William John, Haughton, nr Stafford, Builder. Stafford. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 3 at 12 at Shire Hall, Stafford

Foster, Samuel, Leeds, Gent. Leeds. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 4. Exam Jan 19 at 11 Garthwaite, Charles William, Huddersfield, out of business. Huddersfield. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 4. Exam Jan 22 at 11

Geach, William, Penzance, General Dealer. Truro. Pet Dec 22. Ord Jan 6. Exam Jan 27 at 11.30

Gibby, Thomas, Tavarnebach, nr Tredegar, Brecon, Publican. Tredegar. Pet Dec 31. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 22 at 11.30 at County Court Office, Tredegar

Hagan, Albert, Water lane, Great Tower st, Shipbroker. High Court. Pet Jan 6. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 12 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields

Hardcastle, Joseph, jun, Liverpool, Commission Agent. Liverpool. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 4. Exam Jan 18 at 11 at Court-house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool

Helaby, William George, jun, Denbigh, Photographer. Bangor. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 1

Jones, John, sen, Cardiff, Builder. Cardiff. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 23 at 2

Leason, Robert, Leeds, Glass Dealer. Leeds. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 2 at 11

McDermott, Charles, Biscay rd, Hammersmith. High Court. Pet Dec 28. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 11 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields

Moller, Matthias, West Hartlepool, Ship Chandler. Sunderland. Pet Dec 31. Ord Dec 31. Exam Jan 14

Orange, Walter, Leeds, Tobaccoconist. Leeds. Pet Jan 6. Ord Jan 6. Exam Feb 2 at 11

Owen, Thomas, Brynmawr, Brecon, Grocer. Tredegar. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 22 at 10.30 at County Court Office, Tredegar

Pear, Frank, Carter lane, Linen Collar Manufacturer. High Court. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 4. Exam Feb 11 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields

Podmore, John, Liverpool, Earthenware Dealer. Liverpool. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 18 at 12 at Court-house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool

Pothan, Robert Alfred, Stapleton, Salop, Farmer. Shrewsbury. Pet Jan 2. Ord Jan 2. Exam Feb 8

Quant, Henry, Raven Hill, nr Swansea, Baker. Swansea. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 27

Riley, George, Hucknall Torkard, Nottinghamshire, Cellarman. Nottingham. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 19

Roper, Frank, Halifax, Tailor. Halifax. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 15

Savill, Ann, Withersfield, Suffolk, Farmer, Widow. Cambridge. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 4. Exam Jan 27 at 2

Scott, John William, Keighley, Timber Merchant. Bradford. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 4. Exam Jan 21

Sleeman, Robert Henry, St. Columb Minor, Cornwall, Farmer. Truro. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 27 at 11.30

Smith, James, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Builder. Newport and Ryde. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 10

Strick, James, Jermyn st. High Court. Pet Feb 19. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 9 at 11, at 34, Lincoln's inn fields

Strick, James, Swansea, Coal Exporter. Swansea. Pet Nov 30. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 27

Tarte, Mary, Richards Castle, Herefordshire, Farmer. Leominster. Pet Dec 14. Ord Jan 6. Exam Feb 18

Watts, George Edward, Eastbourne, Builder. Lewes and Eastbourne. Order made under Sec 103. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 29

Walker, William, Sheerness, Engineer. Rochester. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 4 at 2

Williams, Griffith Arthur, Barmouth, Merionethshire, Tailor. Aberystwith. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 30 at 1

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Dec 18

Griener, Walter, Brookville rd, Fulham, Builder. High Court. Pet Apr 11. Ord Dec 16. Exam Jan 29 at 12, at 34, Lincoln's inn fields

FIRST MEETINGS.

Alcock, Samuel, Sunderland, Solicitor. Jan 15 at 12. Queen's Hotel, Fawcett st, Sunderland

Arundale, Frederick Squire, Horsforth, nr Leeds, Fancy Coating Manufacturer. Jan 15 at 11. Official Receiver, St Andrew's chbrs, 22, Park row, Leeds

Bigland, S. H., Gracechurch st, Engineer. Jan 18 at 2. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn

Blackley, John Samuel, Scarborough, Carter. Jan 15 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 74, Newborough st, Scarborough

Box, Edwin, jun, Dewsbury, Yorks, Herring Curer. Jan 15 at 4. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs, Batley

Bowes, John, jun, Leyburn, Yorks, Butcher. Jan 15 at 11.30. Official Receiver in Bankruptcy, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough

Brown, Henry, Buxton, Derbyshire, Bookseller. Jan 15 at 11.30. Official Receiver, County chhrs, Market pl, Stockport.
 Buck, Charles, Gorleston, Suffolk, Smack Owner. Jan 18 at 11.30. L. Blake, South Quay, Gt Yarmouth.
 Burnett, Thomas, Heighington, nr Darlington, Boot Maker. Jan 15 at 11. Official Receiver in Bankruptcy, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough.
 Chilvers, Joseph, and Albert John Powley, Gorleston, Suffolk, Fishing Boat Owners. Jan 18 at 10. L. Blake, South Quay, Gt Yarmouth.
 Chilvers, Joseph (sep estate), Gorleston, Suffolk, Fishing Boat Owner. Jan 18 at 10.30. L. Blake, South Quay, Gt Yarmouth.
 Cole, Alexander, Anerley, Surrey. Jan 18 at 3. Official Receiver, 109, Victoria st, Westminster.
 Colly, George William (sep estate), Pakefield, Suffolk, Boat Owner. Jan 18 at 3.30. Suffolk Hotel, Lowestoft.
 Colly, Robert Capps (sep estate), Kirkley, Suffolk, Boat Owner. Jan 18 at 3. Suffolk Hotel, Lowestoft.
 Colly, William, Robert Capps Colly, and George William Colly, Suffolk, Boat Owners. Jan 18 at 2.15. Suffolk Hotel, Lowestoft.
 Cragg, Edmund, Marsh Chapel, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Jan 20 at 2. Official Receiver, 3, Haven st, Gt Grimsby.
 De Castro, Henry, Borge, Liverpool, Wine Merchant. Jan 20 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Dillon, Francis Charles John William, Villiers st, Strand, Clerk in Somerset House. Jan 18 at 2. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Dunning, Thomas, Sydling St Nicholas, Dorset, Farmer. Jan 15 at 12.30. Antelope Hotel, Dorchester.
 Ellington, Henry Ridley, and John Thomas Aldred, Friday st, Warehousemen. Jan 23 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Finnie, William, Welwyn, Hertfordshire, Esquire. Jan 18 at 11.30. Messrs Ewen and Roberts, 42, Outer Temple, and 222 and 225, Strand.
 Foulkes, John, Kilburn sq, Kilburn, Gentleman. Jan 20 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Garner, William, jun, Acton Bridge, nr Northwich, Timber Merchant. Jan 19 at 10.30. 152, Hospital st, Nantwich.
 George, Aaron, Gorleston, Suffolk, Fishing Boat Owner. Jan 18 at 12. L. Blake, South Quay, Gt Yarmouth.
 Grieves, James, Lime st, Merchant. Jan 18 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Hinchliffe, George Joseph, Rotherham, Yorks, Printer. Jan 19 at 12. Official Receiver, Figtree lane, Sheffield.
 Hinton, John, Prees Heath, nr Whitechurch, Innkeeper. Jan 19 at 11. 152, Hospital st, Nantwich.
 Jones, Thomas, Pembroke, Miller. Jan 19 at 11. Official Receiver, 11, Quay st, Carmarthen.
 Lamb, John Robert, Egremont, Cheshire, Late Draper. Jan 19 at 3. Official Receiver, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool.
 Lee, Henry Southern, Eccles, nr Manchester, out of business. Jan 20 at 11.30. Court house, Encombe pl, Salford.
 Longhurst, James, address unknown, Licensed Victualler. Jan 20 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Macdonald, Charles, Queen Victoria st, Merchant. Jan 18 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Macdonald, Roderick, Ellingham rd, Shepherd's Bush, Iron Merchant. Jan 18 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.
 Morris, Benjamin, and William Rowland Harris, Merthyr Tydfil, Grocers. Jan 15 at 12. Official Receiver, Merthyr Tydfil.
 Norman, Edward H., Birmingham, Factor. Jan 18 at 11. Official Receiver, Birmingham.
 Orange, Walter, Leeds, Tobacconist. Jan 18 at 11. Official Receiver, St Andrew's chhrs, 22, Park row, Lee 15.
 Powell, Abraham, Pembroke, Grocer. Jan 18 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 11, Quay st, Carmarthen.
 Powley, Albert John (sep estate), Gorleston, Suffolk, Fishing Boat Owner. Jan 18 at 11. L. Blake, South Quay, Great Yarmouth.
 Quant, Henry, Raven Hill, near Swansea, Baker. Jan 19 at 11. 6, Rutland st, Swansea.
 Roper, Frank, Halifax, Tailor. Jan 16 at 11. Official Receiver, Townhall chhrs, Halifax.
 Savill, Ann, Withersfield, Suffolk, Farmer. Jan 15 at 2.45. C. F. Freeman, solicitor, Haverhill, Suffolk.
 Sayer, George Edward, Queen's terrace, Kirkwood rd, Peckham, Carpenter. Jan 15 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Scott, John William, Keighley, Timber Merchant. Jan 18 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 21, Manor row, Bradford.
 Smith, Robert, Sheffield, Fruiterer. Jan 19 at 11.30. Official Receiver, Figtree lane, Sheffield.
 Tunnicliff, Thomas, Grantham, Lincolnshire, Tailor. Jan 15 at 12. Official Receiver, 1, High pavement, Nottingham.
 Walker, William, Shoemans, Engineer. Jan 20 at 11.30. Official Receiver, Eastgate, Rochester.
 Walton, James, Barnard Castle, Durham, out of business. Jan 15 at 12. Official Receiver, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough.
 Wilkinson, Arthur, Shipley, Yorks, Coal Merchant. Jan 15 at 11. Official Receiver, 81, Manor row, Bradford.
 Wilson, John, Savile Town, near Dewsbury, Commission Agent. Jan 15 at 3. Official Receiver, Bank chhrs, Batley.

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Jan 1.

Gilbert, William, Southwell, Nottinghamshire, Joiner. Jan 15 at 2. Official Receiver, 1, High pavement, Nottingham.

ADJUDICATIONS.

Arundale, Frederick Squire, Horsforth, nr Leeds, Fancy Coating Manufacturer. Leeds. Pet Jan 2. Ord Jan 4.
 Atkinson, John, Dewsbury, Yorks, Fish Dealer. Dewsbury. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 5.
 Bear, Thomas, Denmark st, Cable st, Bethnal green rd, Cigar Manufacturer. High Court. Pet Nov 17. Ord Jan 5.
 Bigland, S. H., Gracechurch st, Engineer. High Court. Pet Nov 3. Ord Jan 4.
 Boyce, John Raymond, High st, Wapping, Timber Merchant. High Court. Pet Nov 11. Ord Jan 4.
 Brodribb, Charles, Moorledge, Chew Magna, late Farmer. Wells. Pet Dec 19. Ord Jan 4.
 Burton, Edgar, Myrtle ter, Kingston rd, Wimbledon, Corn Merchant. Kingston. Pet Dec 25. Ord Jan 2.
 Charles, Thomas, Llanelli, Carmarthenshire, Butcher. Carmarthen. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5.
 Cragg, Edmund, Marsh Chapel, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Gt Grimsby. Pet Dec 20. Ord Jan 2.
 Disley, James, Wigan, Oil Manufacturer. Wigan. Pet Dec 19. Ord Jan 5.
 Frost, John, East Ham, Essex, Florist. High Court. Pet Dec 8. Ord Jan 6.
 Garner, William, jun, Acton Bridge, nr Northwich, Corn Merchant. Nantwich and Crewe. Pet Dec 11. Ord Jan 5.
 Godly, Thomas, Rotherfield, Sussex, Farmer. Tonbridge Wells. Pet Dec 7. Ord Jan 1.
 Goodhall, John, Middlesbrough, Contractor. Stockton on Tees and Middlesbrough. Pet Nov 9. Ord Jan 4.
 Hinton, John, Prees Heath, nr Whitechurch, Innkeeper. Nantwich and Crewe. Pet Dec 20. Ord Jan 2.
 Hutchinson, Charles Wesley, Newcastle on Tyne, Engineer. Newcastle. Pet Aug 11. Ord Jan 6.

Iles, James Peter, Moncrieff st, Rye lane, Peckham, Slate Merchant. High Court. Pet Dec 31. Ord Jan 4.
 Jordan, Thomas, Dorchester, Builder. Oxford. Pet Dec 12. Ord Jan 4.
 Lane, Richard, Gloucester, Labourer. Gloucester. Pet Jan 1. Ord Jan 4.
 Lee, Henry Southern, Manchester, out of business. Salford. Pet Dec 31. Ord Jan 4.
 Mengel, Carl, Compton terr, Highbury, Schoolmaster. High Court. Pet Dec 11. Ord Jan 5.
 Mills, James William, Birmingham, Police Constable. Birmingham. Pet Dec 7. Ord Jan 5.
 Milner, Arthur, Romford, Essex, Mineral Water Maker. Chelmsford. Pet Dec 12. Ord Jan 5.
 Morse, William Edward, and Samuel Isaac Hayter, Stuckton, nr Fordingbridge, Hampshire, Bakers. Salisbury. Pet Dec 17. Ord Jan 5.
 Podmore, John, Liverpool, Earthenware Dealer. Liverpool. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5.
 Pothan, Robert Alfred, Stapleton, Salop, Farmer. Shrewsbury. Pet Jan 2. Ord Jan 2.
 Rucens, Edwin, Vere st, Clare Market, Licensed Victualler. High Court. Pet Dec 9. Ord Jan 6.
 Roper, Frank, Halifax, Tailor. Halifax. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 6.
 Savill, Ann, Withersfield, Suffolk, Farmer. Cambridge. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 6.
 Sleeman, Robert Henry, New Quay, St Columb Minor, Cornwall, Farmer. Truro. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 6.
 Toogood, Frederick, Westbury on Trym, Baker. Bristol. Pet Dec 14. Ord Jan 6.
 Wilson, John, Savile Town, nr Dewsbury, Yorks, Commission Agent. Dewsbury. Pet Dec 11. Ord Jan 5.

TUESDAY, Jan. 12, 1886.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

Attfield, James, Smallheath, Birmingham, Basket and Perambulator Maker. Birmingham. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 8. Exam Feb 9 at 2.
 Backhouse, Elizabeth, Marton, nr Easingwold, Yorks, Farmer. York. Pet Jan 9. Ord Jan 9. Exam Feb 12 at 11 at Guildhall, York.
 Barker, William Benjamin, Liverpool, Master Mariner. Liverpool. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 9. Exam Jan 21 at 11 at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool.
 Beard, Michael Hill, Leicester, Tailor. Leicester. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 8. Exam Jan 25 at 10.
 Beardmore, James, sen, Newcastle under Lyme, Ironmonger. Hanley, Burslem, and Tunstall. Pet Jan 9. Ord Jan 9. Exam Feb 5 at 11 at Townhall, Hanley.
 Blatchford, George, Barnstable, Carpenter. Barnstable. Pet Jan 9. Ord Jan 9. Exam Jan 22 at 11 at Bridge Hall, Barnstable.
 Brothwood, Edward Frederick, Matlock Bath, Derbyshire, Hotel Proprietor. Derby. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 8. Exam Feb 6.
 Bryson, Henry, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, Restaurant Keeper. Newport and Ryde. Pet Dec 22. Ord Jan 6. Exam Feb 10.
 Burr, James Anderson, Leeds, Agent for the sale of Timber. Leeds. Pet Jan 9. Ord Jan 9. Exam Feb 2 at 11.
 Clarke, Charles James, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire, Hay Dealer. Aylesbury. Pet Jan 7. Ord Jan 7. Exam Feb 10 at 11.30 at County Hall, Aylesbury.
 Corner, John James, Middlesbrough, Grocer. Stockton on Tees and Middlesbrough. Pet Jan 7. Ord Jan 7. Exam Jan 18.
 Earp, W. T., High st, Wandsworth, Corn Dealer. Wandsworth. Pet Nov 13. Ord Jan 7. Exam Feb 11.
 Ellington, Henry Leonard, Trinity sq, Southwark, no occupation. High Court. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 8. Exam Feb 5 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Gibbings, John Durant, North Taunton, Farmer. East Stonehouse. Pet Jan 6. Ord Jan 7. Exam Jan 28 at 11.
 Graham, William, South st, Park lane, Riding Master. High Court. Pet Jan 7. Ord Jan 7. Exam Feb 19 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Heap, Frederick, Lichfield, Licensed Victualler. Burton on Trent. Pet Jan 7. Ord Jan 8. Exam Jan 20 at 14.
 Heynes, Henry, Archway House, Bush lane, Shipping Agent. High Court. Pet Jan 9. Ord Jan 9. Exam Feb 19 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Howe, Henry, Yate, Gloucestershire, Farmer. Bristol. Pet Dec 23. Ord Jan 8. Exam Jan 29 at 12 at Guildhall, Bristol.
 Jackson, Edward Samuel, Speldhurst, Kent, Farmer. Tonbridge Wells. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 8. Exam Feb 4 at 2.
 Littlewood, Horatio, and Charles William Dance, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Fishing Boat Owners. Great Yarmouth. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 8. Exam Feb 8 at 2.30 at Townhall, Great Yarmouth.
 Mitchell, John William Parker, Dewsbury, Yorks, Butcher. Dewsbury. Pet Jan 8. Exam Feb 2.
 Morganti, P., Brighton, Restaurant Proprietor. Brighton. Pet Jan 1. Ord Jan 7. Exam Jan 28 at 11.
 Morris, John, Pearhyndendraeth, Retired Licensed Victualler. Bangor. Pet Dec 24. Ord Jan 8. Exam Feb 1 at 12.30.
 Oand, Frederick, William Ludwig, Wardour st, Soho, Boot Manufacturer. High Court. Pet Jan 9. Ord Jan 9. Exam Feb 13 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Owen, Thomas, Pwllheli, Carnarvonshire, Leather Dresser. Bangor. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 9. Exam Feb 1.
 Petchell, William, Kettering, Shoe Manufacturer. Northampton. Pet Dec 16. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 9.
 Scofield, Charles, Wivenhoe, Essex, Painter. Colchester. Pet Jan 3. Ord Jan 9. Exam Feb 5 at 12 at Townhall, Colchester.
 Spink, Thomas, Great Grimsby, Lincolnshire, Coal Merchant. Great Grimsby. Pet Jan 9. Ord Jan 9. Exam Jan 27 at 11 at Townhall, Great Grimsby.
 Tozer, Samuel, New Clee, Lincolnshire, Master of a Fishing Vessel. Great Grimsby. Pet Jan 6. Ord Jan 7. Exam Jan 27 at 11 at Townhall, Great Grimsby.
 Wales, Dan, Ifield, Sussex, Builder. Brighton. Pet Dec 17. Ord Jan 9. Exam Jan 25 at 11.
 Welge, George Frederick, James st, Bethnal Green, Licensed Victualler. High Court. Pet Jan 7. Ord Jan 7. Exam Feb 16 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Witcomb, Charles, Richard, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. Bristol. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 8. Exam Jan 29 at 12 at Guildhall, Bristol.
 Wrigglesworth, George Henry, Camberwell Green, Licensed Victualler. High Court. Pet Jan 7. Ord Jan 7. Exam Feb 16 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.

The following Amended Notices are substituted for those published in the London Gazette of Jan 1.

Kemp, Cornelius, and Charles Thomas Kemp, Butts lane, Acton, Musical Instrument Dealer. Brentford. Pet Nov 27. Ord Dec 22. Exam Feb 2 at 2.

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED.

Ogilvy, John Bruce, Lytham, Lancaster, no occupation. Brighton. Ord Nov 13. Rescind Jan 7.

FIRST MEETINGS.

Atkinson, John, Dewsbury, Yorks, Fish Dealer. Jan 19 at 11. Official Receiver, Bank chhrs, Batley.
 Austin, Albert, North rd, Caledonian rd, Builder. Jan 30 at 2. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Backhouse, Elizabeth, Marton, nr Easingwold, Yorks, Farmer. Jan 31 at 2. Official Receiver, York.
 Bagruley, Samuel, Blackpool, Lancashire, Grocer. Jan 30 at 3. Official Receiver, 14, Chapel st, Preston.
 Bland, John Nichol, Liverpool, Clothier. Jan 20 at 2.30. Official Receiver, 30, Victoria st, Liverpool.

Brookhouse, Edward Frederick, Matlock Bath, Derbyshire, Hotel Proprietor. Jan 22 at 2.30. Official Receiver, James's chbrs, Derby
 Bryon, Henry, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, Restaurant Keeper. Jan 20 at 3. Official Receiver, Newport, Isle of Wight
 Charles, Thomas, Llanelli, Carmarthenshire, Butcher. Jan 20 at 11. Official Receiver, 11, Quay st, Carmarthen
 Clarke, William John, Haughton, nr Stafford, Builder. Feb 3 at 11.30. County Court Offices, Bank passage, Stafford
 Corner, John James, Middlesbrough, Grocer. Jan 19 at 11. Official Receiver, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
 Dolling, Edwin, Crosby row, Long lane, Bermondsey, Carman. Jan 21 at 12.33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
 Fegen, Margaret Edith, Hereford, Widow. Jan 21 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 2, Offa st, Hereford
 Geach, William, Penzance, General Dealer. Jan 19 at 2. Official Receiver, Boscawen st, Truro
 Gibbings, John Durant, North Tawton, Devon, Farmer. Jan 21 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 18, Frankfort st, Plymouth
 Gibby, Thomas, Tavarnbach, nr Tredegar, Breconshire, Publican. Jan 19 at 10.30. Official Receiver, Merthyr Tydfil
 Hardcastle, Joseph, jun, Anfield, Lancashire, Commission Agent. Jan 21 at 3. Official Receiver, 33, Victoria st, Liverpool
 Heap, Frederick, Lichfield, Licensed Victualler. Jan 19 at 2.30. Official Receiver, St. James's chbrs, Derby
 Helsby, William George, jun, Denbigh, Photographer. Jan 22 at 11. Official Receiver, Crypt chbrs, Eastgate row, Chester
 Hopkinson, Henry, Birstal, Yorks, Butcher. Jan 19 at 10. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs, Batley
 Howat, Robert, Willow pl, Stamford hill, Furniture Dealer. Jan 20 at 2. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portland st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Howe, Henry, Yate, Gloucestershire, Farmer. Jan 22 at 1. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs, Bristol
 Iles, James Peter, Moncrieff st, Rye lane, Peckham, Slate Merchant. Jan 21 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portland st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Jones, John, sen, Cardiff, Builder. Jan 21 at 2.30. Official Receiver, 3, Crockherbtown, Cardiff
 Kemp, Charles Thomas (sep estate), Butts lane, Acton, Musical Instrument Dealer. Jan 19 at 12. 28 and 29, St Swithin's lane
 Kemp, Cornelius (sep estate), All Saints Fields, Acton, Musical Instrument Dealer. Jan 19 at 11.30. 28 and 29, St Swithin's lane
 Kemp, Cornelius, and Charles Thomas Kemp, Butts lane, Acton, Musical Instrument Dealers. Jan 19 at 11. 28 and 29, St Swithin's lane
 Laen, Thomas Lennard, Cardiff, Surgeon. Jan 22 at 3.30. Official Receiver, 3, Crockherbtown, Cardiff
 O'Connell, Bernard, Liverpool, out of business. Jan 20 at 2. Official Receiver, 33, Victoria st, Liverpool
 Oldroyd Brothers, Bole, Yorks, Cloth Finishers. Jan 19 at 3. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs, Batley
 Owen, James, Bangor, Carnarvonshire, Master Mariner. Jan 22 at 12. Official Receiver, Crypt chbrs, Eastgate row, Chester
 Owen, Thomas, Brynmawr, Breconshire, Grocer. Jan 19 at 12. Official Receiver, Merthyr Tydfil
 Owen, Thomas, Pwllheli, Carnarvonshire, Leather Dresser. Jan 21 at 2. Crown Hotel, Pwllheli
 Polmore, John, Liverpool, Earthenware Dealer. Jan 21 at 2. Official Receiver, 33, Victoria st, Liverpool
 Pothan, Robert Alfred, Stapleton, Salop, Farmer. Feb 8 at 10.30. Law Society, Talbot chbrs, Shrewsbury
 Read, Charles Allen, Greenhithe, Kent. Jan 21 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portland st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Richards, Joseph, Cardiff, Butcher. Jan 22 at 2.30. Official Receiver, 3, Crockherbtown, Cardiff
 Sheerman, John, jun, Paddington st, St Marylebone, Builder. Jan 20 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portland st, Lincoln's inn fields
 Sleeman, Robert Henry, Newquay, St Columb Minor, Cornwall, Farmer. Jan 19 at 10. Great Western Hotel, Newquay
 Smith, James, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Builder. Jan 20 at 4. Official Receiver, Newport, Isle of Wight
 Strick, James, Swansea, Coal Exporter and General Merchant. Jan 19 at 2. 6, Rutland st, Swansea
 Tozer, Samuel, New Clec, Lincolnshire, Master of a Fishing Vessel. Jan 20 at 1. Official Receiver, 3, Haven st, Gt Grimsby
 Westcott, Caleb, Gloucester rd, Brixton, Commercial Traveller. Jan 20 at 12.33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
 Witcomb, Charles Richard, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. Jan 22 at 12.30. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs, Bristol

ADJUDICATIONS.

Buck, Charles, Gorleston, Suffolk, Snackowner. Great Yarmouth. Pet Dec 20. Ord Jan 8
 Bushby, Frederick, Worthing, Fruit Grower. Brighton. Pet Oct 15. Ord Jan 9
 Chivers, Joseph, and Albert John Powley, Gorleston, Suffolk, Fishing Boat Owners. Great Yarmouth. Pet Dec 20. Ord Jan 8
 Cole, William Henry, Canterbury, Grocer's Assistant. Canterbury. Pet Dec 11. Ord Jan 4
 Corner, John James, Middlesbrough, Grocer. Stockton on Tees and Middlesbrough. Pet Jan 7. Ord Jan 7
 Dawes, Edgar, Eastbourne, Lime Merchant. Lewes and Eastbourne. Pet Dec 16. Ord Jan 7
 Doughton, Thomas, Aberystwith, Cardiganshire, Earthenware Dealer. Aberystwith. Pet Dec 18. Ord Jan 7
 Farralley, Sawyer, and John Edmond Harrison, Colne, Lancashire, Grocers. Burnley. Pet Dec 10. Ord Jan 7
 Geach, William, Penzance, General Dealer. Truro. Pet Dec 22. Ord Jan 7

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.
 Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates keeps for years in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas thickened yet weakened with starch, &c., and is REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny. COCOATINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Manilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tins at 1s. 6d., 3s., 6s. 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietor, H. SCHWEITZER & Co., 10, Adam-st., Strand, London, W.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE MAKERS,



BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS

SOLICITORS' GOWNS.

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS

ESTABLISHED 1830.

24, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

George, Aaron, Gorleston, Suffolk, Fishing Boat Owner. Great Yarmouth. Pet Dec 20. Ord Jan 8
 Gibby, Thomas, Tavarnbach, nr Tredegar, Brecon, Publican. Tredegar. Pet Dec 31. Ord Jan 8
 Gribberg, Morris, Brighton, Jeweller. Brighton. Pet Nov 9. Ord Jan 7
 Hitchcock, Thomas, Newport Pagnell, Buckinghamshire, Tailor. Northampton. Pet Dec 20. Ord Jan 2
 Hopkinson, Henry, Birstal, Yorkshire, Butcher. Dewsbury. Pet Dec 23. Ord Jan 7
 Kemp, Cornelius, and Charles Thomas Kemp, Butts lane, Acton, Musical Instrument Dealers. Brentford. Pet Nov 27. Ord Jan 4
 Leah, Henry, Hart st, Bloomsbury, Auctioneer. High Court. Pet July 31. Ord Jan 7
 Leason, Robert, Leeds, Glass and China Dealer. Leeds. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 7
 Little, James, Manchester, Mourning Outfitter. Manchester. Pet Dec 9. Ord Jan 7
 Littlewood, Horatio, and Charles William Dance, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Fishing Boat Owners. Great Yarmouth. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 9
 Longhurst, James, Newington causeway, Licensed Victualler. High Court. Pet Nov 18. Ord Jan 9
 Masters, William Henry, Midsomer Norton, Somerset, Miller. Wells. Pet Dec 30. Ord Jan 6
 McDermott, Charles, Biscay rd, Hammersmith. High Court. Pet Dec 28. Ord Jan 8
 Orange, Walter, Leeds, Tobaccoist. Leeds. Pet Jan 6. Ord Jan 7
 Owen, Thomas, Brynmawr, Brecon, Grocer. Tredegar. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 8
 Tunnell, Thomas, Grantham, Lincolnshire, Tailor. Nottingham. Pet Jan 2. Ord Jan 8
 Rogers, Henry Gane, Midsomer Norton, Somerset, Carriage Builder. Wells. Pet Dec 15. Ord Jan 7
 Scarr, Bethel Bower, Kingston upon Hull, Boat Builder. Kingston upon Hull. Pet Dec 17. Ord Jan 8
 Swann, William, Scarborough, Saddler. Scarborough. Pet Dec 23. Ord Jan 8
 Tong, Stephen, Dunkirk, nr Faversham, Fruit Dealer. Canterbury. Pet Dec 21. Ord Jan 8
 Tozer, Samuel, New Clec, Lincolnshire, Master of a Fishing Vessel. Gt Grimsby. Pet Jan 6. Ord Jan 9
 Vicary, John, Henry Holman, Exbourne, Devon, Miller. East Stonehouse. Pet Dec 19. Ord Jan 7
 Weige, George Frederick, James st, Bethnal green, Licensed Victualler. High Court. Pet Jan 7. Ord Jan 7
 Willis, Edward Avery, West Wrating, Cambridgeshire, Gentleman. Cambridge. Pet Nov 26. Ord Jan 9

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—*Tnon*, 26s.: *Country*, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS	175	Re Jackson, Kino v. Pickard	181
THE LAW COURTS UNDER THE JUDICATURE ACTS	177	CASES AFFECTING SOLICITORS:—	
HOW SHOULD THE LAND LAWS BE REFORMED?	178	Gibbs v. Trevellick, Re Armstrong	181
RECENT DECISIONS	179	Batten v. The Wedgwood Coal and Iron Co.	181
CORRESPONDENCE	179	Woolley v. Colman	182
CASES OF THE WEEK:—		READING ASSIZES	182
COURT OF APPEAL:—		SOCIETIES	182
Reg. v. Radge and others	179	OBITUARY	184
London and Blackwall Railway Co. v. Cross	179	LEGAL APPOINTMENTS	184
HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE:—		COURT PAPERS	185
Re Sheerman, Deceased, Hartmann v. Sheerman	180	LEGAL NEWS	191
Re G. A. Bright-Smith (Deceased)	180	COMPANIES	191
		CREDITORS' CLAIMS	192
		LONDON GAZETTES, &c., &c.	192

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.—All communications intended for publication in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer.

* * The Publisher requests that early application should be made by persons desirous of obtaining back numbers of the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, as only a small number of copies remain on hand.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for the return of rejected communications.

UNTEARABLE LETTER COPYING BOOKS.

HOWARD'S PATENT.

Stronger and more durable than any other Letter Copying Books now made.

THE COPYING BOOK FOR THE PROFESSION.

PRICE LIST UPON APPLICATION.

WODDERSPOON & CO.,

7, SERLE STREET, and 1, PORTUGAL STREET
 LINCOLN'S INN, W.C.